

The Classical Review

JULY 1895.

GERMAN OPINION ON GREEK JUSSIVES.

BEFORE entering on a task which amounts to nothing short of a critique on the most vexed questions of *Tempuslehre* I must disclaim all pretence to anything like completeness. The literature which has appeared in Germany bearing directly or indirectly on this subject is so vast that one might put together a large volume by merely compiling synopses of the various monographs, magazine articles and books specially devoted to this important branch of Grammar. Any one in the least familiar with the far-famed *deutsche Gründlichkeit* must know that it cannot fail to have left its mark on a subject which has been keenly debated since the beginning of this century. For the purposes of the present paper it will suffice if we deal only with such theories as have found their way into the school-grammars of the best recognized authors, with the addition of one or two more noteworthy contributions to German philological journals. It will, however, be necessary to approach the matter from a broader point of view than was requisite in my previous paper. There being no difference between present and aorist imperatives other than that which prevails between present and aorist stems, one is absolutely compelled to resume the discussion under this wider aspect.

In so doing it will be advisable to start with a brief statement of the general principles of *Tempuslehre* on which German scholars are agreed. Readers already familiar with these will pardon the

NO. LXXX. VOL. IX.

insertion here, as it tends to clearness in discussing those further questions which are moot points among the various schools.

1. German Grammarians, who are nothing if not philosophical, tell us that two elements enter into the constitution of grammatical tense, viz.: (a) the *time* of the action (*Zeitstufe* or order in time), (b) its *nature*, quality or character (*Actionsart* or *Zeitart*).

2. The *time*, as is known, is either *absolute*—if reckoned from the point of view of the speaker, i.e. from the moment of utterance—or *relative* when measured, not from the speaker's standpoint, but from some other action or moment explicitly or implicitly alluded to by him. The use of relative time is seen to advantage in Latin where it has almost a monopoly of two tenses, namely the future perfect and pluperfect, Greek having recourse under similar circumstances to the aorist. Relative time with its connotation of simultaneity, priority, futurity, has no special forms, exclusively its own, in Greek, nor indeed, it would seem, in any Indo-European languages.

3. All *present*, *aorist* and *perfect* stems are *per se zeitlos*, i.e. do not express order in time. It is only in the indicative mood that we find tenses directly expressing the time of an action (*Zeitstufe*). Past time, for instance, is formally expressed by the *augment*; present time, as such, is marked by no specific word-formation.

4. The tenses of all moods other than

U

the indicative, the participle included, do not express a *time*-difference; they merely serve to denote the quality of the action (*Actionsart*).

All German scholars are practically unanimous in regarding the foregoing principles as axiomatic in any system of *Tempuslehre*.¹

In confirmation of what has been said, it may be well to cite authorities. Delbrück in his *Syntaktische Forschungen* (iv. page 80) writes confidently as follows:—

Dass die Stämme des Praesens, des Aorists, des Perfectums verschiedene Actionen bezeichnen (das Praesens etwa die dauernde, der Aorist die eintretende, das Perfectum die vollendete Handlung), dass die bestimmte Action in jeder Form des Stammes, in den Modi so gut wie im Indicativ zur Erscheinung kommt, dass ferner die Zeitstufe nur in dem Augment sichtbar bezeichnet ist—diese Wahrheiten, um deren Gewinnung sich Georg Curtius das grösste Verdienst erworben hat, sind wohl jetzt in das allgemeine Bewusstsein übergegangen.' Koch, in stating the intro-

¹ Owing to the fact that the aor. participle does *de facto* most frequently refer to past time, exception has been taken to the general rule, no. 4, stated above. See Fox's '*Rede für die Megalopoliten*' (page 66): 'Das Part. Aor.' lehrt mit anderen Brugmann in seiner gr. Gramm. S. 10 'hat nichts von Vergangenheitsbedeutung an sich; diese wird, wo sie vorzuliegen scheint, nur erst durch die bestimmte Verbindung erzeugt, ist also zufällig.' Thatsächlich bezeichnet das Part. Aor. in den allermeisten Fällen eine Vergangenheit, freilich nicht allemal eine (nach dem Zeitpunkt, welcher für den Sprechenden Gegenwart ist, zu bestimmende) *absolute* (wie in *ὅρα τὸν ποιήσαντα*), sondern sehr häufig eine (nach der durchs Hauptverbum bezeichneten Zeit zu bestimmende) *relative*, so dass es bald einem Plusquamperf. entspricht...bald einem einfachen Praeteritum...bald einem Fut. exact...' The objection here raised meets in my opinion with a satisfactory solution only on the hypothesis—which shall be afterwards insisted on—that the radical idea inherent in the aor. stem is that of 'concluded action.' Another objection which occurs to me is the somewhat awkward presence of future infinitives active middle and passive (formed from various stems) side by side with the present, perfect and aor. infinitives. Grammarians seem to confine their attention to the latter. To me such forms as *ποιήσῃν*, *λυθῆσθαι*, *εἰρησθῆναι* seem to express *Zeitstufe*. Forms like *ποιήσῃν* may represent the *Actionsart* of pres. or aor. stems, while in each case referring apparently to future time. The difficulty which here presents itself is to a certain extent got rid of, partly by reference to Philology which teaches that these forms are *Griechische Neubildungen*, partly by explaining that their syntactical function is intention not time, at least primarily, as is seen illustrated by the well-known use of the future participle. Other exceptions alleged from Or. obliq. are more apparent than real.

ductory principles of his *Tempuslehre*, opens with the 'dreifache Beschaffenheit der Handlung' with regard to the *character of the action* expressed by the three primary tenses (pres. aor. perf.).²

The various systems put forward by German scholars to set forth the nature of the action (*Actionsart*) expressed by the three primary stems, pres. aor. and perfect, may be conveniently grouped under three heads.

Under the first may be placed that of Hermann, Kühner and the two Buttmanns as representing the earliest attempts at a true solution of this question. According to this school the radical idea inherent in the three stems respectively is, for the grammatical present, that of 'dauernde Handlung,' for the aorist 'momentane Handlung,' and for the perfect 'vollendete Handlung.' It may be here observed once and for all that divergence of opinion turns mainly on the function of present and aorist stems, the perfect being almost universally admitted to express concluded or completed action, the results remaining. Philip Buttmann's terminology is not exactly that of scholars of the present day. He does not seem to have used the terms *Zeitstufe* and *Actionsart*,³ which apparently originated with G. Curtius. Nevertheless his theory, in its general outlines, is substantially such as we have described above, as may be gathered from his own words. Speaking of the distinction between present and aorist in the so-called subordinate moods, he writes: 'dass sie (die Griechische Sprache) sich der Modi des Praesens hauptsächlich bedient um eine *dauernde*, der Modi des Aorist um eine *momentane* Handlung zu bezeichnen.'⁴

It is not improbable that Buttmann obtained his idea of 'momentane Handlung' as attaching to the aorist stem from Hermann. The latter seems to insinuate as

² Brugmann, from whom much of the foregoing summary is drawn, starts from exactly similar first principles, as do also Curtius-Hartel, Kaegi and others. Krüger, who is known to have worked out his theories independently not only of G. Curtius' leading, but of that of all his other contemporaries, has nevertheless in this matter arrived at practically identical results. Difference of opinion manifests itself in settling the various stem functions.

³ This seems to me preferable to the word *Zeitart* which is used as synonymous—less accurately, as I think, inasmuch as the stem function is not a quality of *time* or of tense but rather a quality of *action*.

⁴ Philipp Buttmann's *Griechische Grammatik*, herausgegeben etc. von A. Buttmann (Berlin 1854), 19 ed. § 137. 5. So also in other earlier and later editions.

much in his work 'Vigerius annotated by Hermann, &c.'¹

Kühner's views, at least such as they appeared in the earlier edition, may be gathered from the following passage: 'Daher wird der Aorist überall da gebraucht, wo der Sprechende ein in die Vergangenheit fallendes Prädikat als *momentan* darstellen will, gleichviel ob dieselbe in der Wirklichkeit von kurzer oder langer Dauer gewesen sein mag.'²

Buttmann further points out that, in the indicative mood, present time possesses only one form to render momentary and continuous action. This single form of double import (twofold *Actionsart*) is seemingly that formed from the present stem. Hence, according to this author, present stems may have a twofold function, expressing also, at least vicariously, the fundamental idea inherent in the aorist, which in Buttmann's system is that of momentary action.

In a previous paper I endeavoured to apply this canon to the imperative mood as well as to subjunctive jussives. The results were anything but satisfactory. To me it seems that when I say ἀκούσον I may indeed be referring to an action calling for considerably protracted effort on the part of the listener. Several examples were put forward in which the present is employed of actions that are usually regarded as momentary, e.g. παῖ, καλεῖ Χαρμίδην, —ἐκβαίν' ἀπ'ἡνός τῆσδε, &c. In reply it may be urged that these and the like actions are in the eyes of the speaker regarded as continuous, and that the aorist may only be used when they are exclusively looked on as momentary. Such would seem to be the view of Kühner. This is also Mr. Sidgwick's way of putting the distinction between present and aorist when he tells us that the aorist marks 'a single occurrence *not regarded* as protracted in time.' Such explanations serve merely to divert the attention from objective facts, and leave everything to the idiosyncrasy of the individual. In other words, if I choose

¹ 'Præsens enim et aoristus in caeteris præter indicativum modis eo maxime differunt, quod præsens rem *diutius durantem* vel saepius repetitam, aoristus rem brevi absolutam aut semel factam indicat. Inapte dicas γράφον βίβλον, quia hoc longi temporis opus est: recte vero ὁδὸς τὴν χεῖρα quia hoc brevi temporis momento fit. Exemplis nihil opus, quum utique obvia sint. Explicatus disserui de hac re in Censura tertiæ editionis grammaticæ Buttmanianæ in diar. litter. Lips. a. 1805 m. mart. n. 59 col 617. s., *adscivitque postea hanc rationem Buttmanus* et exposuit in gram. gr. § 124.' Opus supra citatum. Lipsiæ 1822 adnot. 165 b ad pag. 215.

² R Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache*. Hannover 1834—35. 1 Auflage.

to regard an action as momentary, I use the aorist: if I prefer to look on the same act as continuous, I use the present. This line of reasoning leads, in my opinion, to hopeless subjectivity, and would, if put in practice, prove of dubious service both to critic and tiro alike. With criteria of this sort *quot capita tot sententiæ* and, what is more, every one would be right. Schoolmasters must henceforth refrain from altering a present to an aorist or *vice versa*, if they will not incur the risk of being told by a pupil that he regards as continuous what his master looks upon as momentary. In the employment of purely relative terms it is no exaggeration to say that there must be difference of opinion.

Whether for these or other reasons, it is now no longer the fashion among German scholars to describe the 'Actionsart' of the aorist stem as 'momentane Handlung.' In the next system which calls for notice, the term 'momentary' tends to disappear, its place being taken by that of 'eintretende Handlung.'

The second theory and the one which finds most favour in Germany at the present day represents the radical meaning of the three primary stems as being respectively 'dauernde Handlung' for the present, 'eintretende Handlung' for the aorist and 'vollendete Handlung' for the perfect. This is the doctrine of by far the great majority of living German scholars.

Brugmann³ has the following: 'Der Præsens, der Aorist und der Perfekt-stamm bezeichneten verschiedene Arten (Qualitäten) der Handlung und zwar, nach der gewöhnlichen Definition, das Præsens die dauernde, der Aor. die eintretende, das Perf. die abgeschlossen vorliegende Handlung.' Curtius-Hartel⁴ has exactly the same distinctions and the same terminology save that he makes use of the word 'vollendet' instead of 'abgeschlossen' in describing the quality of the perfect stem.

Krüger's⁵ teaching is practically the same; he uses the words 'dauernd' and 'eintretend' in speaking of present and aorist respectively. Kaegi⁶ speaks of the *indicativus præsentis* and *imperfectum* as 'die Tempora der sich entwickelnden andauernden Handlungen.' According to this author the *Indicativus Aoristi* 'bezeich-

³ *Griech. Gr.* § 110 page 150. second ed.

⁴ Curtius-Hartel's *Griech. Schulgramm.* 19 ed. 1890. § 193—198

⁵ K. W. Krüger, *Griech. Sprachlehre für Schulen*, 5 ed. Syntax § 53.

⁶ Ad. Kaegi, *Griech. Schulgr.* second ed. 1889. § 181, cf. § 188, 189.

the indicative, the participle included, do not express a *time*-difference; they merely serve to denote the quality of the action (*Actionsart*).

All German scholars are practically unanimous in regarding the foregoing principles as axiomatic in any system of *Tempuslehre*.¹

In confirmation of what has been said, it may be well to cite authorities. Delbrück in his *Syntaktische Forschungen* (iv. page 80) writes confidently as follows:—

Dass die Stämme des Praesens, des Aorists, des Perfectums verschiedene *Actionen* bezeichnen (das Praesens etwa die dauernde, der Aorist die eintretende, das Perfectum die vollendete Handlung), dass die bestimmte Action in jeder Form des Stammes, in den Modi so gut wie im Indicativ zur Erscheinung kommt, dass ferner die *Zeitstufe* nur in dem Augment sichtbar bezeichnet ist—diese Wahrheiten, um deren Gewinnung sich Georg Curtius das grösste Verdienst erworben hat, sind wohl jetzt in das allgemeine Bewusstsein übergegangen.' Koch, in stating the intro-

¹ Owing to the fact that the aor. participle does *de facto* most frequently refer to past time, exception has been taken to the general rule, no. 4, stated above. See Fox's '*Rede für die Megalopoliten*' (page 66): 'Das Part. Aor. lehrt mit anderen Brugmann in seiner gr. Gramm. S. 10 'hat nichts von Vergangenheitsbedeutung an sich; diese wird, wo sie vorzuliegen scheint, nur erst durch die bestimmte Verbindung erzeugt, ist also zufällig.' Thatsächlich bezeichnet das Part. Aor. in den allermeisten Fällen eine Vergangenheit, freilich nicht allemal eine (nach dem Zeitpunkte, welcher für den Sprechenden Gegenwart ist, zu bestimmende) *absolute* (wie in *ὅπῃ τὸν ποιεῖν*), sondern sehr häufig eine (nach der durchs Hauptverbum bezeichneten Zeit zu bestimmende) *relative*, so dass es bald einem Plusquamperf. entspricht...bald einem einfachen Praeteritum...bald einem Fut. exact...' The objection here raised meets in my opinion with a satisfactory solution only on the hypothesis—which shall be afterwards insisted on—that the radical idea inherent in the aor. stem is that of 'concluded action.' Another objection which occurs to me is the somewhat awkward presence of future infinitives active middle and passive (formed from various stems) side by side with the present, perfect and aor. infinitives. Grammarians seem to confine their attention to the latter. To me such forms as *ποιεῖν*, *λυθῆσθαι*, *εἰρησθαι* seem to express *Zeitstufe*. Forms like *ποιήσιν* may represent the *Actionsart* of pres. or aor. stems, while in each case referring apparently to future time. The difficulty which here presents itself is to a certain extent got rid of, partly by reference to Philology which teaches that these forms are *Griechische Neubildungen*, partly by explaining that their syntactical function is intention not time, at least primarily, as is seen illustrated by the well-known use of the future participle. Other exceptions alleged from Or. obliq. are more apparent than real.

dutory principles of his *Tempuslehre*, opens with the 'dreifache Beschaffenheit der Handlung' with regard to the *character of the action* expressed by the three primary tenses (pres. aor. perf.).²

The various systems put forward by German scholars to set forth the nature of the action (*Actionsart*) expressed by the three primary stems, pres. aor. and perfect, may be conveniently grouped under three heads.

Under the first may be placed that of Hermann, Kühner and the two Buttmanns as representing the earliest attempts at a true solution of this question. According to this school the radical idea inherent in the three stems respectively is, for the grammatical present, that of 'dauernde Handlung,' for the aorist 'momentane Handlung,' and for the perfect 'vollendete Handlung.' It may be here observed once and for all that divergence of opinion turns mainly on the function of present and aorist stems, the perfect being almost universally admitted to express concluded or completed action, the results remaining. Philip Buttmann's terminology is not exactly that of scholars of the present day. He does not seem to have used the terms *Zeitstufe* and *Actionsart*,³ which apparently originated with G. Curtius. Nevertheless his theory, in its general outlines, is substantially such as we have described above, as may be gathered from his own words. Speaking of the distinction between present and aorist in the so-called subordinate moods, he writes: 'dass sie (die Griechische Sprache) sich der Modi des Praesens hauptsächlich bedient um eine *dauernde*, der Modi des Aorist um eine *momentane* Handlung zu bezeichnen.'⁴

It is not improbable that Buttmann obtained his idea of 'momentane Handlung' as attaching to the aorist stem from Hermann. The latter seems to insinuate as

² Brugmann, from whom much of the foregoing summary is drawn, starts from exactly similar first principles, as do also Curtius-Hartel, Kaegi and others. Krüger, who is known to have worked out his theories independently not only of G. Curtius' leading, but of that of all his other contemporaries, has nevertheless in this matter arrived at practically identical results. Difference of opinion manifests itself in settling the various stem functions.

³ This seems to me preferable to the word *Zeitart* which is used as synonymous—less accurately, as I think, inasmuch as the stem function is not a quality of *time* or of *tense* but rather a quality of *action*.

⁴ Philipp Buttmann's *Griechische Grammatik*, herausgegeben etc. von A. Buttmann (Berlin 1854), 19 ed. § 137. 5. So also in other earlier and later editions.

much in his work 'Vigerius annotated by Hermann, &c.'¹

Kühner's views, at least such as they appeared in the earlier edition, may be gathered from the following passage: 'Daher wird der Aorist überall da gebraucht, wo der Sprechende ein in die Vergangenheit fallendes Prädikat als *momentan* darstellen will, gleichviel ob dieselbe in der Wirklichkeit von kurzer oder langer Dauer gewesen sein mag.'²

Buttmann further points out that, in the indicative mood, present time possesses only one form to render momentary and continuous action. This single form of double import (twofold *Actionsart*) is seemingly that formed from the present stem. Hence, according to this author, present stems may have a twofold function, expressing also, at least vicariously, the fundamental idea inherent in the aorist, which in Buttmann's system is that of momentary action.

In a previous paper I endeavoured to apply this canon to the imperative mood as well as to subjunctive jussives. The results were anything but satisfactory. To me it seems that when I say *ἀκούσον* I may indeed be referring to an action calling for considerably protracted effort on the part of the listener. Several examples were put forward in which the present is employed of actions that are usually regarded as momentary, e.g. *παί, κάλει Χαριμόδην, — ἐκβαίν' ἀτήνης τῆσδε*, &c. In reply it may be urged that these and the like actions are in the eyes of the speaker regarded as continuous, and that the aorist may only be used when they are exclusively looked on as momentary. Such would seem to be the view of Kühner. This is also Mr. Sidgwick's way of putting the distinction between present and aorist when he tells us that the aorist marks 'a single occurrence *not regarded* as protracted in time.' Such explanations serve merely to divert the attention from objective facts, and leave everything to the idiosyncrasy of the individual. In other words, if I choose

¹ 'Praesens enim et aoristus in caeteris praeter indicativum modis eo maxime differunt, quod praesens rem *diutius durantem* vel saepius repetitam, aoristus rem *brevi absolutam* aut *semel factam* indicat. Ineptè dicas *γράφον βίβλον*, quia hoc longi temporis opus est: recte vero *ὁδὸν τὴν χεῖρα* quia hoc brevi temporis momento fit. Exemplis nihil opus, quum utique obvia sint. Explicatius disserui de hac re in Censura tertiae editionis grammaticae Buttmannianae in diar. litter. Lips. a. 1805 m. mart. n. 59 col 617. s., adscivique postea hanc rationem Buttmannus et exposuit in gram. gr. § 124.' Opus supra citatum. Lipsiae 1822 adnot. 165 b ad pag. 215.

² R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache*. Hannover 1834—35. 1 Auflage.

to regard an action as momentary, I use the aorist: if I prefer to look on the same act as continuous, I use the present. This line of reasoning leads, in my opinion, to hopeless subjectivity, and would, if put in practice, prove of dubious service both to critic and tiro alike. With criteria of this sort *quot capita tot sententiae* and, what is more, every one would be right. Schoolmasters must henceforth refrain from altering a present to an aorist or *vice versa*, if they will not incur the risk of being told by a pupil that he regards as continuous what his master looks upon as momentary. In the employment of purely relative terms it is no exaggeration to say that there must be difference of opinion.

Whether for these or other reasons, it is now no longer the fashion among German scholars to describe the 'Actionsart' of the aorist stem as 'momentane Handlung.' In the next system which calls for notice, the term 'momentary' tends to disappear, its place being taken by that of 'eintretende Handlung.'

The second theory and the one which finds most favour in Germany at the present day represents the radical meaning of the three primary stems as being respectively 'dauernde Handlung' for the present, 'eintretende Handlung' for the aorist and 'vollendete Handlung' for the perfect. This is the doctrine of by far the great majority of living German scholars.

Brugmann³ has the following: 'Der Präsens, der Aorist und der Perfektstamm bezeichneten verschiedene Arten (Qualitäten) der Handlung und zwar, nach der gewöhnlichen Definition, das Präsens die dauernde, der Aor. die eintretende, das Perf. die abgeschlossen vorliegende Handlung.' Curtius-Hartel⁴ has exactly the same distinctions and the same terminology save that he makes use of the word 'vollendet' instead of 'abgeschlossen' in describing the quality of the perfect stem.

Krüger's⁵ teaching is practically the same; he uses the words 'dauernd' and 'eintretend' in speaking of present and aorist respectively. Kaegi⁶ speaks of the *indicativus praesentis* and *imperfectum* as 'die Tempora der sich entwickelnden andauernden Handlungen.' According to this author the *Indicativus Aoristi* 'bezeich-

³ *Griech. Gr.* § 110 page 150, second ed.

⁴ Curtius-Hartel's *Griech. Schulgramm.* 19 ed. 1890. § 193—198.

⁵ K. W. Krüger, *Griech. Sprachlehre für Schulen*, 5 ed. Syntax § 53.

⁶ Ad. Kaegi, *Griech. Schulgr.* second ed. 1889. § 181, cf. § 188, 189.

the indicative, the participle included, do not express a *time*-difference; they merely serve to denote the quality of the action (*Actionsart*).

All German scholars are practically unanimous in regarding the foregoing principles as axiomatic in any system of *Tempuslehre*.¹

In confirmation of what has been said, it may be well to cite authorities. Delbrück in his *Syntaktische Forschungen* (iv. page 80) writes confidently as follows:—

Dass die Stämme des Praesens, des Aorists, des Perfectums verschiedene *Actionen* bezeichnen (das Praesens etwa die dauernde, der Aorist die eintretende, das Perfectum die vollendete Handlung), dass die bestimmte Action in jeder Form des Stammes, in den Modi so gut wie im Indicativ zur Erscheinung kommt, dass ferner die *Zeitstufe* nur in dem Augment sichtbar bezeichnet ist—diese Wahrheiten, um deren Gewinnung sich Georg Curtius das grösste Verdienst erworben hat, sind wohl jetzt in das allgemeine Bewusstsein übergegangen.' Koch, in stating the intro-

¹ Owing to the fact that the aor. participle does *de facto* most frequently refer to past time, exception has been taken to the general rule, no. 4, stated above. See Fox's '*Rede für die Megalopoliten*' (page 66): 'Das Part. Aor.' lehrt mit anderen Brugmann in seiner gr. Gramm. S. 10 'hat nichts von Vergangenheitsbedeutung an sich; diese wird, wo sie vorzuliegen scheint, nur erst durch die bestimmte Verbindung erzeugt, ist also zufällig.' Thatsächlich bezeichnet das Part. Aor. in den allermeisten Fällen eine Vergangenheit, freilich nicht allemal eine (nach dem Zeitpunkt, welcher für den Sprechenden Gegenwart ist, zu bestimmende) *absolute* (wie in *ὁπῶ τὸν ποιεῖν*), sondern sehr häufig eine (nach der durchs Hauptverbum bezeichneten Zeit zu bestimmende) *relative*, so dass es bald einem Plusquamperf. entspricht....bald einem einfachen Praeteritum....bald einem Fut. exact...' The objection here raised meets in my opinion with a satisfactory solution only on the hypothesis—which shall be afterwards insisted on—that the radical idea inherent in the aor. stem is that of 'concluded action.' Another objection which occurs to me is the somewhat awkward presence of future infinitives active middle and passive (formed from various stems) side by side with the present, perfect and aor. infinitives. Grammarians seem to confine their attention to the latter. To me such forms as *ποιεῖν*, *λυθῆσθαι*, *εἰρησθαι* seem to express *Zeitstufe*. Forms like *ποιήσων* may represent the *Actionsart* of pres. or aor. stems, while in each case referring apparently to future time. The difficulty which here presents itself is to a certain extent got rid of, partly by reference to Philology which teaches that these forms are *Griechische Neubildungen*, partly by explaining that their syntactical function is intention not time, at least primarily, as is seen illustrated by the well-known use of the future participle. Other exceptions alleged from Or. obliq. are more apparent than real.

ductory principles of his *Tempuslehre*, opens with the 'dreifache Beschaffenheit der Handlung' with regard to the *character of the action* expressed by the three primary tenses (pres. aor. perf.).²

The various systems put forward by German scholars to set forth the nature of the action (*Actionsart*) expressed by the three primary stems, pres. aor. and perfect, may be conveniently grouped under three heads.

Under the first may be placed that of Hermann, Kühner and the two Buttmanns as representing the earliest attempts at a true solution of this question. According to this school the radical idea inherent in the three stems respectively is, for the grammatical present, that of 'dauernde Handlung,' for the aorist 'momentane Handlung,' and for the perfect 'vollendete Handlung.' It may be here observed once and for all that divergence of opinion turns mainly on the function of present and aorist stems, the perfect being almost universally admitted to express concluded or completed action, the results remaining. Philip Buttmann's terminology is not exactly that of scholars of the present day. He does not seem to have used the terms *Zeitstufe* and *Actionsart*,³ which apparently originated with G. Curtius. Nevertheless his theory, in its general outlines, is substantially such as we have described above, as may be gathered from his own words. Speaking of the distinction between present and aorist in the so-called subordinate moods, he writes: 'dass sie (die Griechische Sprache) sich der Modi des Praesens hauptsächlich bedient um eine *dauernde*, der Modi des Aorist um eine *momentane* Handlung zu bezeichnen.'⁴

It is not improbable that Buttmann obtained his idea of 'momentane Handlung' as attaching to the aorist stem from Hermann. The latter seems to insinuate as

² Brugmann, from whom much of the foregoing summary is drawn, starts from exactly similar principles, as do also Curtius-Hartel, Kaegi and others. Krüger, who is known to have worked out his theories independently not only of G. Curtius' leading, but of that of all his other contemporaries, has nevertheless in this matter arrived at practically identical results. Difference of opinion manifests itself in settling the various stem functions.

³ This seems to me preferable to the word *Zeitart* which is used as synonymous—less accurately, as I think, inasmuch as the stem function is not a quality of *time* or of tense but rather a quality of *action*.

⁴ Philipp Buttmann's *Griechische Grammatik*, herausgegeben etc. von A. Buttmann (Berlin 1854), 19 ed. § 137. 5. So also in other earlier and later editions.

much in his work 'Vigerius annotated by Hermann, &c.'¹

Kühner's views, at least such as they appeared in the earlier edition, may be gathered from the following passage: 'Daher wird der Aorist überall da gebraucht, wo der Sprechende ein in die Vergangenheit fallendes Prädikat als *momentan* darstellen will, gleichviel ob dieselbe in der Wirklichkeit von kurzer oder langer Dauer gewesen sein mag.'²

Buttmann further points out that, in the indicative mood, present time possesses only one form to render momentary and continuous action. This single form of double import (twofold *Actionsart*) is seemingly that formed from the present stem. Hence, according to this author, present stems may have a twofold function, expressing also, at least vicariously, the fundamental idea inherent in the aorist, which in Buttmann's system is that of momentary action.

In a previous paper I endeavoured to apply this canon to the imperative mood as well as to subjunctive jussives. The results were anything but satisfactory. To me it seems that when I say ἀκούσον I may indeed be referring to an action calling for considerably protracted effort on the part of the listener. Several examples were put forward in which the present is employed of actions that are usually regarded as momentary, e.g. παῖ, κάλει Χαρμίδην, — ἐκβαλ' ἀπ' ἡγῆς τῆδε, &c. In reply it may be urged that these and the like actions are in the eyes of the speaker regarded as continuous, and that the aorist may only be used when they are exclusively looked on as momentary. Such would seem to be the view of Kühner. This is also Mr. Sidgwick's way of putting the distinction between present and aorist when he tells us that the aorist marks 'a single occurrence *not regarded* as protracted in time.' Such explanations serve merely to divert the attention from objective facts, and leave everything to the idiosyncrasy of the individual. In other words, if I choose

to regard an action as momentary, I use the aorist: if I prefer to look on the same act as continuous, I use the present. This line of reasoning leads, in my opinion, to hopeless subjectivity, and would, if put in practice, prove of dubious service both to critic and tiro alike. With criteria of this sort *quot capita tot sententiae* and, what is more, every one would be right. Schoolmasters must henceforth refrain from altering a present to an aorist or *vice versa*, if they will not incur the risk of being told by a pupil that he regards as continuous what his master looks upon as momentary. In the employment of purely relative terms it is no exaggeration to say that there must be difference of opinion.

Whether for these or other reasons, it is now no longer the fashion among German scholars to describe the 'Actionart' of the aorist stem as 'momentane Handlung.' In the next system which calls for notice, the term 'momentary' tends to disappear, its place being taken by that of 'eintretende Handlung.'

The second theory and the one which finds most favour in Germany at the present day represents the radical meaning of the three primary stems as being respectively 'dauernde Handlung' for the present, 'eintretende Handlung' for the aorist and 'vollendete Handlung' for the perfect. This is the doctrine of by far the great majority of living German scholars.

Brugmann³ has the following: 'Der Präsens, der Aorist und der Perfektstamm bezeichneten verschiedene Arten (Qualitäten) der Handlung und zwar, nach der gewöhnlichen Definition, das Präsens die dauernde, der Aor. die eintretende, das Perf. die abgeschlossen vorliegende Handlung.' Curtius-Hartel⁴ has exactly the same distinctions and the same terminology save that he makes use of the word 'vollendet' instead of 'abgeschlossen' in describing the quality of the perfect stem.

Krüger's⁵ teaching is practically the same; he uses the words 'dauernd' and 'eintretend' in speaking of present and aorist respectively. Kaegi⁶ speaks of the *indicativus praesentis* and *imperfectum* as 'die Tempora der sich entwickelnden andauernden Handlungen.' According to this author the *Indicativus Aoristi* 'bezeich-

³ *Griech. Gr.* § 110 page 150, second ed.

⁴ Curtius-Hartel's *Griech. Schulgramm.* 19 ed. 1890. § 193—198

⁵ K. W. Krüger, *Griech. Sprachlehre für Schulen*, 5 ed. Syntax § 53.

⁶ Ad. Kaegi, *Griech. Schulgr.* second ed. 1889. § 181, cf. § 188, 189.

¹ 'Praesens enim et aoristus in caeteris praeter indicativum modis eo maxime differunt, quod praesens rem *diutius durantem* vel saepius repetitam, aoristus rem *brevi absolutam* aut *semel factam* indicat. Inepte dicas γράφον βιβλον, quia hoc longi temporis opus est: recte vero ὁδὸς τὴν χεῖρα quia hoc brevi temporis momento fit. Exemplis nihil opus, quum utique obvia sint. Explicatus disserui de hac re in Censura tertiae editionis grammaticae Buttmannianae in diar. litter. Lips. a. 1805 m. mart. n. 59 col. 617. s., *adscivique postea hanc rationem Buttmannus et exposuit in gram. gr. § 124.* Opus supra citatum. Lipsiae 1822 adnot. 165 b ad pag. 215.

² R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Griechischen Sprache.* Hannover 1834—35. 1 Auflage.

net die Handlung an sich oder die *eintretende Handlung*.' From the extract already given it may be gathered that Delbrück¹ holds similar views. This system has also found its way into Latin Grammar. Thus Schmalz² (*Lat. Gramm.* § 22) 'In our doctrine of the use of tenses we distinguish in the first place the order in time (*Zeitstufen*) present, past and future, and within each of these again, the quality of the action, whether ingressive, continuous or completed (*die Zeitart des Eintritts, der Dauer und der Vollendung*).'

These quotations must suffice as a guarantee of the widespread acceptance of what we have designated as theory no. 2. What is most striking in this system is the new function ascribed to the aorist stem. 'Die eintretende Handlung'—'Der Eintritt einer Handlung'—these are terms of wide compass and certainly seem to hit off the various meanings which *de facto* attach to the grammatical aorist. What is more familiar than the ingressive or inceptive aorist? And is not this idea neatly conveyed by the word *eintreten*—a word which obviously marks entrance into a state or action? Again, the aorist indicative expresses the most absolute of past occurrences and *eintreten* is equally appropriate there, as it also answers to our word 'to occur.' Thus German scholars are lucky enough to find in their language one word that will express the two apparently different ideas of 'occurrence' and 'ingressive action.' This is certainly a happy coincidence. It must however be admitted that these two notions are not evolved from their common source quite in the way indicated. To the German mind 'der Eintritt einer Handlung,' taken as a universal idea, conveys directly the notion of entrance into a state and commencement of action (one must enter somewhere or else enter on action). The same word also evokes the concept (*Begriff*) of entrance on the scene of reality. Now to enter on the

scene of reality is to belong to the category of accomplished facts and hence of 'occurrences.' G. Curtius was evidently aware of the ambiguity involved in this wonderful word *eintreten*. In his *Erläuterungen* he writes as follows: 'Die Handlung des Aorists (können wir) die eintretende nennen... Eintreten ist zunächst durchaus verschieden von beginnen oder bevorstehen. Die eintretende Handlung hat vielmehr einen doppelten Gegensatz, einmal das Verweilen an einem Orte. Der Eintritt des Winters ist seiner Fortdauer entgegengesetzt (*νοῦναι—νοεῖν, βασιλεῦναι—βασιλεύειν*). Zweitens aber ist das Eintreten eines Ereignisses seinen Vorbereitungen entgegengesetzt (*πρᾶξαι—πράττειν, πᾶσαι—πεῖθειν*). Endlich wird mit dem Worte Eintreten... immer und durchweg eine Handlung ausgedrückt, die auf einen Schlag vollzogen wird...' ³ It is clear that our English vocabulary lacks a word of sufficient expansiveness to convey the four apparently distinct notions, namely (1) entrance as opposed to permanent abode, (2) actual event or occurrence as opposed to preliminary preparations, (3) 'eine Handlung die auf einen Schlag vollzogen wird' ⁴ and (4), *pace* Curtius, ingressive action. Krüger,⁵ who has been styled *ὁ γραμματικώτατος*, seems to have discovered *suo Marte* this same appellative 'eintretende Handlung.' But he attributes to it a somewhat different meaning from that of Curtius.

After stating his general rule, § 53. 5, he continues thus in obs. 1: 'Am deutlichsten zeigt sich die *inchoative* Bedeutung bei Verben, die im Präsens etwas Zuständliches bezeichnen: *ἐβασίλευσα* wurde König &c. &c.'

This very elasticity of the word *eintreten*, as well as the consequent ambiguity,⁶ constitutes in my opinion its weightiest condemnation. At any rate its adoption in English is scarcely feasible, inasmuch as we do not, so far as I know, possess a word which will at once express all those notions *eintreten* conveys to German scholars.

¹ The reference referred to contains perhaps only an *obiter dictum*; see note further on.

² The same occurs in several school-grammars, e.g. Goldbacher § 387 (fifth ed.). This author does not however use the word *dauernd*, adopting instead the term *sich entwickelnd*, and in so far as is in advance of the theory we are now discussing. As regards the Latin Syntax the authors referred to differ in many matters of detail. Compare for instance the various views put forward by Lattmann, *N. J. B.* 1892, page 132 sq., Waldeck, *N. J. B.* 1890, page 379, Landgraf in *Anmerk. zu den Vorlesungen von Reisig-Haase*, N. 448 and 448a, and Wetzel in *Beiträge zur Lehre von der Consec. temp. im Lateinischen*.

³ G. Curtius, *Erläuterungen zu meiner griech. Schulgr.* 8 Aufl. page 182.

⁴ This is a return to the familiar idea of 'momentary action.'

⁵ Cf. Krüger's *Krit. Anal.* 1, page 159 and *Stud.* 2, page 128.

⁶ This ambiguity has not escaped the notice of German scholars. Koch in the earlier editions of his *Grammar* for greater clearness makes use of two words, e.g. 8 Aufl. § 100. 1 'Der Konj. Optat. etc. des Aor. bezeichnen die Handlung schlechthin (faktische Bedeutung), häufig speciell das Eintreten der Handlung (ingressive Bedeutung) ohne alle Angabe der Zeit.'

Moreover, if we were disposed to accept this way of looking at the aorist stem, and only sought an exactly corresponding word (I doubt if there can be a single concept answering to such a farrago of objective reality), would it not be preferable to select a term even more prolific in signification, which should also cover the notions coming under gnomic and dramatic (conversational) aorists?

But such a word, if found, would only convey a medley of disparate notions and not give the one radical idea inherent in the aorist stem. And yet this is the object of our quest, rather than to discover a single-word *tessera* which shall summarize the various uses experience teaches to belong to the aorist.¹

Were it only for its vagueness and the obscurity thence arising, Curtius' description of aorist *Actionsart* should be rejected. But, it may be asked, is there *de facto* a single unequivocal notion underlying the various aoristic formations? Scholars have always presumed as much, and all the theorizing on the subject rests on the truth of this assumption. To such an objection the best answer is—*solvitur ambulando*.

Let us now turn to the present stem function, which so far has been described as that of 'dauernde Handlung.' Time, as

every one will admit, is something external to our actions. True, every exercise of activity takes place in time: we cannot rid ourselves of it. It remains none the less an extraneous relation and can by no means, in the strictest sense, be regarded as an internal quality of action. Now it cannot be too frequently pointed out that, in investigating the radical meaning of the three primary tenses, we are not seeking for the quality of the *time* of the action, but solely for the nature or character of the *action* itself. We are loud in our assertions that these stems do not express time; our German friends are never tired of reiterating the axiom that the Aorist, Present and Perfectstämme are *zeitlos*. Is it not then somewhat inconsistent to look for the quality of the action in what is after all a time-denomination? Duration as opposed to non-duration or momentariness is, to my mind, a time-qualification and is only in a secondary sense a quality of action, because forsooth all acts are performed in time. Hence, if we are to carry out our first principles to their logical issue, we must, in settling the *Actionsart*, altogether throw off the shackles of time, and consequently set aside the word duration. I am glad to find myself not alone of this opinion. Dr. Koch in the preface to his *Griechische Schulgrammatik* (13 Aufl. 1889) writes: 'Und so bin ich denn zu der Ueberzeugung gelangt, dass der Begriff der Dauer als irreführend aus der Grammatik überhaupt entfernt...werden muss.'

J. DONOVAN.

(To be continued.)

THE CLASSIFICATION OF CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.

IN a friendly review of Mr. Sonnenschein's *Greek Syntax*, which recently appeared in these pages, the critic devoted more space to the treatment of conditional sentences than to any other portion of the book, because, as he says, the method adopted in it 'is but a poor makeshift' or 'positively erroneous.' It is described as misleading in practice and unscientific in theory. Yet a careful consideration of the question tends to convince the student that after all it is Mr. Sonnenschein who is right.

There are three possible ways of classifying conditional sentences, viz. (i) by time,

(ii) by fulfilment, (iii) by form. The first is the system of Prof. Goodwin, the second is proposed by Mr. Donovan when he says that 'recourse should at once be had to the universal canon of fulfilment or non-fulfilment' (p. 64a) and the third that of Mr. Sonnenschein. The first method produces what even Prof. Goodwin himself (*M. T.* § 397) admits to be the astonishing spectacle of two sentences coinciding in external form entirely divorced from one another, viz. 'the more vivid future' and 'the present general.' And further, by uniting the Present with the Past, and separating the Present from the Future, it

contravenes the far-reaching principle of Greek Syntax that the main division of tenses is that of Primary and Historic. These two reasons, which moreover do not stand alone, are fatal to any theory professing to be scientific.

'The universal canon of fulfilment or non-fulfilment' next requires examination. To be accurate, by 'non-fulfilment' is meant 'that it is enough that it (the condition) should be assumed to be such' (*i. e.* unfulfilled) (p. 64a); and of course by 'fulfilment' it is not implied that the condition is actually fulfilled. Therefore the universal canon resolves itself into this. Conditions are to be divided into (i) those which imply or assume without implying that the condition is not fulfilled, and (ii) those which do not assume or imply that the condition is not fulfilled. This is hardly the rule to lay before 'the more backward boy.' It begins by bringing a comparatively rare class of conditional sentences (the unfulfilled) into undue prominence, so that the other class cannot even be defined except in relation to them unless the most cumbersome phraseology be employed. It leaves a heterogeneous collection of sentences to be re-sorted on some new *fundamentum divisionis*, in which we have an uneasy feeling that we shall be invited to be 'vivid' or 'vague', to be 'remote' and 'speculative'; and finally, if unkindly fate lead the scholar's straying steps to Demosthenes, he will find a sentence of this form, which neither implies nor assumes that the condition is unfulfilled, but distinctly states its fulfilment; *de F. L.* 318, 153 (167) *εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν, ὡς ἦσαν τότε, Φωκεῖς σῶσι καὶ Πύλας εἶχον, ἐκεῖνος μὲν οὐδὲν ἂν ὑμῖν εἶχεν ἀνατείνασθαι φοβερόν.*

There remains the division according to form. While ascribing this system to Mr. Sonnenschein's book, I frankly admit that it may be doubted whether this was the original principle of division, or only its accidental final result. That the latter is the case may be inferred by the banishment of *εἰ* with fut. ind. to a note, and the dislocation of *ἐὰν ποιῇ, ἀμαρτήσεται* from its proper place beside *ἐὰν κλέπῃ, κολάζεται*. It is axiomatic that the division by form, and not by sense, is the truly scientific one, because like forms must (originally at least) have like meanings, but like meanings need not have like forms. And this is the actual practice of grammarians, *e. g.* though *γένοιτο*

ἂν means much the same as *γενήσεται*, it is treated in every syntax (*e. g.* *M. T.* pp. 77—86) closely with *ἐγένετο ἂν* and severed from *γενήσεται*. Therefore conditional sentences must be divided into those with *ἂν* and those without *ἂν*, while the latter may again be subdivided by form, according as the protasis is expressed by *εἰ* with the Indic. or by *ἐάν* with the Subj. It then becomes perfectly clear that the forms without *ἂν* state what 'was' or 'is' or 'will be', while those with *ἂν* state what 'might' or 'would be' or 'have been.' And in the subdivision *εἰ* with the Indic. is used of a single case occurring at a definite time¹, *ἐάν* with the Subj. of a general case, *i. e.* one which occurs often (indef. frequency) or at an indefinite time (indef. frequency).

Three claims then may be put forward for this system: (i) it is scientific, (ii) it is simple, (iii) it is practical. The first two claims require no further argument. The last is denied by Mr. Donovan. Yet every schoolboy can see the difference between 'is' 'was' 'will be' and 'might be' 'might have been' &c. It is a hard saying when this obvious distinction is described as 'a rule of thumb' or 'a search for "would be" or other variations'; neither is it any criterion to produce sentences like 'if it were desirable, we might give proof,' and demand that they should at once be ticketed. A sound scheme of conditional sentences should set clearly before a boy the Greek equivalent of each English conditional sentence when, but not before, he has taken the trouble to find out what his English sentence really means, and this is done more simply in Mr. Sonnenschein's *Grammar* than in any other with which I am acquainted.

C. D. CHAMBERS.

¹ It is curious that grammarians do not appear to recognize the obvious fact that *εἰ ποῖσσι ταῦτα, ἀδικήσσι* differs from *ἐὰν ποῖσσι ταῦτα, ἀδικήσσι* in precisely the same way that *εἰ ἀδικήσσι* differs from *ἐὰν ἀδικήσσι*, viz. the former in each case is definite, the latter indefinite. Of course in the 'present general' the indefiniteness is habitually indefinite frequency, in the 'more vivid future' it is indefinite futurity (hence Goodwin's mistake, *loc. cit.*). The various 'minatory,' 'monitory' or 'modal' theories are attempts to find some other distinction between these two forms of future conditions; in so far as these distinctions exist, they are merely accidental. Does any one doubt that 'if you do this tomorrow at 12 o'clock precisely' must be *εἰ ποῖσσι* not *ἂν ποῖσσι*? Yet it is certainly not minatory, or monitory or modal.

HARNACK ON THE INSCRIPTION OF ABERCIUS.

Zur Abercius-Inchrift, von ADOLF HARNACK (Texte und Untersuchungen xii. 4b. 28 pp.). Leipzig: Hinrichs. 1895. M. 6.50.

THE discovery of the Inscription of Abercius, bishop of Hierapolis in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, was one of the best results won by Prof. W. M. Ramsay in the course of his archaeological researches in Asia Minor. Its interest lay in the fact that it is the very inscription which the author of the Greek Acts of Abercius copied from the stone into his narrative some time in the fourth century.

At first sight the discovery goes far to establish the historical character of these Acts, the main incident of which is the inspired visit of Abercius to Rome to expel a demon from Lucilla, the daughter of Marcus Aurelius and Faustina. And accordingly the Pope communicated to Prof. Ramsay his grateful recognition of the service so rendered by him to Christian archaeology; and more recently the fragment of the inscription so found was procured by Monsignor Azarian, the Uniat Armenian patriarch of Constantinople, and presented to the Pope on the occasion of his jubilee. German scholars however are not equally satisfied as to the Christian character of the inscription, and G. Ficker (*Sitzungsber. d. K. Preuss. Akad. der Wissensch.* 1 Feb. 1894, p. 87 ff.) contends that Abercius was a priest of Cybele, just as Tillemont long ago denied its Christian character. Theodore Zahn on the other hand declares it to be both Christian and orthodox.

In the tract before us Harnack steers a middle course, and concludes that Abercius was neither wholly pagan nor wholly Christian, but an adherent of some heathen-gnostic circle of believers; and he finds the key to the obscurities of the inscription in the description given by Philippus Sidetes of an early syncretist cult, which he probably knew in Pamphylia, and in which Hera was identified with Mary the Virgin and Helios with God the Father.

It is not my intention to try *tantas componere lites*; and in the rest of this note I would only point out that the old Armenian version of these Acts throws some light, welcome though small, on the very obscure text of the inscription. This version was probably made in the eleventh century, and

I copied it a year ago from a MS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale, *Anciens Fonds Arménien*, 46, vol. 3, fol. 100 v. This codex is of the thirteenth century, and is of enormous size and weight, written in majuscule letters half an inch high. In order to read it, you must stand up and sit down alternately; and it is too big for transport by the book-lift. Therefore I recommend no student to ask for it, for fear the library attendant should contract such a grudge against him as he clearly did against me. I transcribe in English letters (following Hübschmann's phonetization) the rhythmic Armenian version of the inscription:—

entreal telvóys kalákaci
zays ararí gir kentani
i žam marimvóys zor unēi
dnel ęst zanún aberkēi
minę araceál zjoks oęxari
i cayr leránę ev i dašti=
unelov áęs mecamecs ameneviń
makur anelcs : yaynzam ayspēs
inj karozeac, ev grov i hróm
zis arakeac : ztagavorác
xumpn and kutel, ev ztaguhiń
ar nkatel : ork yoski
zgęstęs zardareal
yoski kaušikęs paču
ęeal : and žolovurd
paycar tesimal · pay
car knkóv tearn droš
meal : ęnd asoris an
di darjeal ev zasor
oę daštń koxeal
zmecs kalaks or and
teseal, i mecbńa ye'p
rat anęeal : šara
hantęs isk paulosi
ęnd astuac baniv an
ci : yamenayń yara
adēm, ev i havátęn
nerks adēm : ęzkera
kír nkanę yerkrę, a
vandelóv meci getę :
zor ęnkav koys anca
nak, et sireleac utel

yatak : en zkalera
 goynen mist gini, tal
 of (lege ov) xatneal ar end haci.

This answers literally to the following :—

Of the chosen spot a citizen
 this I made a writing alive
 in the time of the body which I had,
 to place, by name Abercius
 whilst feeding the flocks of sheep
 on the tops of mountains and on the
 plain,
 having eyes very large wholly
 pure imperishable. Then thus
 to me he preached, and with writing to
 Rome

me sent ; there of the kings
 the band to muster ; and the princesses
 to observe, who in golden
 raiment are adorned,
 with gold slippers decorated.
 There the crowd
 brilliant observing, with brilliant
 seal of the Lord stamped.
 Unto Syria then
 turning and the Syrian
 plain treading
 the great cities which (are) there
 having beheld. To Nisibis over
 the Euphrates having passed, a fellow-
 struggle in troth with Paul.
 With God by (his) word I passed.
 In all ways facing forward,
 and unto the faith inwardly
 facing. The food
 of fish from the earth,
 tendering large from river.
 Which received a virgin pure,
 gave to the loved ones to eat
 as a symbol (or 'parable') ; and the most
 sweet wine for ever, giving (it)
 mixed with bread.

At this point the Paris codex,—which
 contains the only full and unabridged
 Armenian text which I have seen of this
 apocryph,—breaks off abruptly, leaving a
 page blank. I have tried in my English
 to parallel the rudeness of the version,
 which must have been made from a Syriac
 version of the metaphrast's recension.

Yet, rude as it is, the version supplies a
 lacuna in the Greek text, of which lines
 5, 6 and 7 run thus :

ὀφθαλμοὺς ὅς ἔχει μεγάλους πάντῃ καθορῶντας
 οὗτος γάρ μ' ἐδίδαξε.....γράμματα πιστά.
 Εἰς πόμην ὅς ἐπεμψεν ΕΜΕΝ ΒΑΣ[Ι]ΔΗ¹
 ἀναθρήσαι.

¹ The capitals mark those letters which are still
 legible on the stone.

I should read line 6 thus :

ἀφθάρτους οὕτως μ' ἐδίδαξε καὶ γράμματι πιστῶ,

and line 7 perhaps thus :

εἰς Ῥώμην προσέπεμψεν ἔμεν κ.τ.λ.

According to the story told in these Acts
 the emperor Marcus Aurelius sent a special
 message to Abercius at Hierapolis to come
 to Rome to heal his daughter. Therefore
 the reading γράμματι implied by the Ar-
 menian is better than γράμματα. The word
 πιστῶ has either dropped out of or been
 neglected by the version.

Further in line 5 the translator seems to
 have read καθαρούς τε κάθθ. ; but πάντῃ
 καθορῶντας is surely right. The words in
 l. 7 βασιλῇ ἀναθρήσαι have been much dis-
 cussed. βασιλῇ is still legible on the stone,
 and is therefore a datum, but the meta-
 phrast's Greek text has βασιλειαν ἀθρήσαι.
 The Armenian reading is due to the original
 translator having read ἀθροῖσαι for ἀθρήσαι.
 He no doubt did his work in a hurry.

In line 11 of the Greek is another crux.
 It reads thus :

ΕΥΦΡΑΤΗΝΔΙΑΒΑΣ ΠΑΝΤΗΔΕΣΧΟΝ ΣΥΝΟ-
 μηγίρους.

Here for the last word the Armenian
 suggests συναγωνα, which however conflicts
 with the stone. συνομιλους and συνοδιτην
 are conjectured by Harnack and Zahn
 respectively.

Line 12 both of the inscription and of
 the metaphrast's text seems hopeless.
 Harnack prints thus :

ΠΑΥΛΟΝ ΕΧΩΝ ΕΠΟ... ΠΙΣΤΙΣ² πάντῃ δὲ
 προήγε

whereas the metaphrast has :

Παῦλον ἔσωθεν πίστις πάντῃ δὲ προήγε.

The stone is broken asunder in the
 middle of this twelfth line, and ten of the
 letters on it are uncertain, and thirteen
 altogether absent. The Armenian is very
 tantalizing. The words 'In all ways facing
 forward' answer to πάντῃ δὲ προήγε. 'In-
 wardly facing' echoes ἔσωθεν, a misreading
 by the Greek compiler of ἔχων ἐπ or of ἔχων
 alone. The translator must have introduced
 the words 'with God by word' *de suo*. But

² The underlined uncials are not certain.

the word *ançi* which = 'I passed by (or over)' may answer to *ἐπόμην*.

Line 13 and 14 run thus:

ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΕΘΗΚΕ τροφήν ΠΑΝΤΗ ΙΧΘΥΝ
ἀπὸ πηγῆς
ΠΑΝΜΕΓΕΘΗ ΚΑΘΑΡὸν δὲ ΕΔΡΑΞΑΤΟ ΠΑΡ-
ΘΕΝΟΣ ἀγνή.

The Version seems to have first rendered ἀπὸ πηγῆς as if ἀπὸ γῆς, and then to have corrected his blunder, and both blunder and correction are preserved in the Armenian. He also read *ἐδέξατο* for *ἐδράξατο*, but the latter is evidenced by the stone and is the *lectio potior*. In Christian catacombs we find just such representations of the Eucharistic meal as ll. 13-15 of the inscription contain; and Harnack's scepticism as regards them seems to be very unnecessary.

The Armenian can of course only serve to rectify the metaphrast's text *where* the inscription itself, as rescued by Prof.

Ramsay, is illegible or wanting. I think that the single certain emendation ἀφθάρτους, which it yields in l. 6, justifies me in calling attention to it. For Harnack, in his zeal to prove that the inscription is more pagan than Christian, hints that the metaphrast, in copying the inscription, here omitted on purpose some pagan expression. 'Übrigens fehlt vor γράμματα in M ein Wort, welches der Vers nothwendig verlangt. Ist das zufällig? Stand hier vielleicht etwas, was der Abschreiber zu unterdrücken für gut befand.' The Armenian text however proves that the metaphrast or author of these Acts—whoever he was—did copy a word here, and that the lacuna is merely due to his Greek scribes.

For convenience of reference I add the full text of the inscription as it is printed by Harnack. Capitals indicate those parts of the inscription which remain.

[Ε]ΚΛΕΚΤΗΣ ΠΟ[ΛΕ]ΩΣ Ο ΠΟΛΕΙ[ΤΗΣ Τ]ΟΥΤ ΕΠΟΙΗ[ΣΑ
ΖΩΝ Ι]Ν ΕΧΩ καιρῷ ΣΩΜΑΤΟΣ ΕΝΘΑ ΘΕΣΙΝ
ΟΥ[Ν]ΟΜ ἀβέρκιος ὃν ὁ[Μ]ΑΘΗΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΓΝΟΥ
ὃς βόσκει προβάτων ἀγέλας ὄρεσιν πεδίοις τε
5 ὀφθαλμοὺς ὃς ἔχει μεγάλους πάντα καθορώντας
οὗτος γάρ μ' ἐδίδαξε γράμματα πιστά
ΕΙΣ ΡΩΜΗΝ ὃς ἐπέμψεν ΕΜΕΝ ΒΑΣ[Ι]ΔΗ ἀναθρήσαι
ΚΑΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΣΑΝ ἰδεῖν χρυσόστολον ΧΡΥσοπέδιλον
ΛΑΟΝ ΔΕΙΔΟΝ ἐκεῖ λαμπρὰν ΣΦΡΑΓΕΙΔΑΝ Εχοντα
10 ΚΑΙ ΣΥΡΙΗΣ ΠΕΔΟΝ εἶδον ΚΑΙ ΑΣΤΕΑ ΠΑΝτα νισίβιν
ΕΥΦΡΑΤΗΝ ΔΙΑβάς πανΤΗ ΔΕΣΧΟΝ ΣΥΝΟμηγύρους
ΠΑΥΛΟΝ Ε(ΧΩΝ) ΕΠΟ . . . (ΠΣΤΙΣ) πάντα δὲ προήγε
ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΕΘΗΚΕ τροφήν ΠΑΝΤΗ ΙΧΘΥΝ ἀπὸ πηγῆς
ΠΑΝΜΕΓΕΘΗ ΚΑΘΑΡὸν δὲ ΕΔΡΑΞΑΤΟ ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ ἀγνή
15 ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ ΕΠΕΔΩΚΕ ΦΙΛΟΙΣ ΕΣΘειν διὰ παντός
οἶνον χρηστὸν ἔχουσα κέρασμα διδοῦσα μετ' ἄρτον
ταῦτα παρεστὼς εἶπον ἀβέρκιος ὡδε γραφῆναι
ἐβδομήκοστον ἔτος καὶ δεύτερον ἡγον ἀληθῶς
ταῦθ' ὁ νοῦν εὐξαίθ' ὑπὲρ ἀβερκίου πᾶς ὁ συνωδός
20 ΟΥ ΜΕΝΤΟΙ ΤΥΜΒ[Ω]Ι ΤΙΣ ΕΜΟΙ ΕΤΕΡΟΝ ἐπάνω ΘΗΣΕΙ
ΕΙ Δ ΟΥΝ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΤΑ[Μ]ΕΚΩΙ ΘΗΣΕΙ ΔΙΣ[Χ]ΕΙΛΙΑ
[Χ]ΡΥΣΑ
ΚΑΙ [Χ]ΡΗΣΤΗ ΠΑΤΡΙΔ[Ι] ΙΕΡΟΠΟΛΕΙ [Χ]ΕΙΛΙ[Α Χ]ΡΥΣΑ.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

CRITICAL NOTES ON CLEM. AL. STROM. VI.

§ 1, p. 736. τὸν τρόπον τῆς θρησκείας...
ἐκτιθέμενος ὅσα τε εἰς γραφήν...ἐγχαράξαι.
Read γε for τε, as in v. 10, p. 650 ὅσα τε
εἰς γνώσιν αὐτῶν ἀφίκτο.

§ 2. Put a full stop after συνεγράψαντο

('in the meadow there is no separation between different sorts of flowers, though some people have used the term metaphorically for artificial arrangements of selections'). I prefer to omit the comma

between ἐπιτήδες and ἀναμίξ: 'the arrangement of my treatise has been diversified with subjects intentionally mingled together to imitate a meadow,' cf. p. 901 ἐξεπιτήδες ἀναμειγμένης τῆς φυτείας. Just below put a full stop after σωτηρίαν.

§ 3, p. 737. ἦν οὐκ ἂν ποτε ἔγωγε γνῶσιν τε ὀνομάσαιμι καὶ τὴν δι' αἰσθητηρίων ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι πεφυκῆναι. Speaking of an intelligence which is shared even by the brutes, C. says 'he could never call by the name of knowledge that which is of a nature to be perceived through the senses also' (i.e. as well as through the understanding). Read γε and τὴν καί. Just below, the genitive τῶν παραπολλυμένων is governed by οἰκτῆρμον, and should be so punctuated (cf. ἐλεῖμων τῶν χρυσίδων, Pax 425).

§ 4. παραστήσαντες δὲ τὴν ἔμφασιν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἐπινοίας (so quoted by Euseb. instead of the διανοίας of MS.) ἐκ τῆς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς δεδομένης ἀληθείας περιανγασθείσαν, καθ' ὃ σημαίνονμεν διήκειν εἰς αὐτοὺς τὴν κλοπὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκδεχόμενοι, εἰ μὴ ἐπαχθεῖς εἰπῶν, ἀπεδείξαμεν. φέρε μάρτυρας τῆς κλοπῆς αὐτοὺς καθ' ἑαυτῶν παραστήσωμεν. In this difficult sentence the first thing is to restore the apodosis by putting a comma before φέρε. I should then translate 'Having set forth the significance of the Greek invention (the mysteries spoken of in the preceding sentence) illuminated by the truth bestowed on us through the scriptures (interpreting it in accordance with which signification we have proved, if it is not invidious to say so, that the stolen truth has made its way to them), come, let us bring forward the Greeks as witnesses of theft against themselves.' I am not sure that we should not read the future ἀποδείξομεν, as, in the preceding sentence, C. talks of the discussion of the mysteries as something which is to follow.

Ib. σχολῇ γ' ἂν...ἀφέξονται. Read οὖν for ἂν.

§ 6, p. 738. Full stop after ἀναίνομαι.

§ 18, p. 747. For ἀσχετος ἀτῆ, which is contrary to the context, read ἄσχετος with the editors of Theognis.

§ 20, p. 748. (A quotation from An-docides) τὴν μὲν παρασκευὴν...σχεδὸν τι πάντες εἴσεσθε. It is hardly likely that εἴσεσθε is written by error for the original ἐπίσ-τασθε, but it may perhaps be a corruption of ἥσθησθε. Shortly afterwards omit τε after Φιλίνος.

§ 22. Εὐριπίδης ἐν ἑξαμέτρῳ χρήσει φησὶν. So Dindorf after Hemsterhuis for MS. τηρήσει. Is it not easier to read τῷ

ρήσει ('in a speech' rather than 'in a quotation')? [Here I find I am anticipated by I.B. in *J. of Phil.* iv. p. 215.] If ἑξαμέτρῳ is right, it seems to be used in the sense of *senarius*.

[§ 23, p. 750. ἀρχὴ μὲν ἔρωτος ὄρασις, μείοι δὲ τὸ πάθος ἐλπίς. Perhaps τελειοί. I.B.]

§ 29, p. 753. ὁ βρέχων ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους διὰ τῶν ὑποτεταμένων δυνάμεων εἰς ἑστὶ θεός. For ὑποτεταμένων read ὑποτεταγμένων. In the following sentence, ἱστοροῦσιν Ἕλληνες ἐκλειπόντων ποτὲ τῶν ἐτησίῳ ἀνέμων, Ἀρισταῖον...θῦσαι ἱκμαίω Διὶ πολλή γάρ ἦν φθορὰ φλογμῷ διαπιμπραμένῳ πάντων, καὶ δὴ καὶ τῶν ἀναψύχειν τοὺς καρποὺς εἰωθότων ἀνέμων μὴ πνεόντων, ῥαδίως αὐτοὺς ἀνεκαλέσαστο, the last clause comes in very awkwardly. Perhaps we should insert ὥς after Ἕλληνες, and read Ἀρισταῖος and θίσας, making the clause from πολλή to πνεόντων parenthetical. The construction would be clearer if the comma were moved from after πάντων to after φθορὰ.

§ 30, p. 754. ὁ γὰρ κύριος τῶν κυρίων καὶ θεὸς τῶν θεῶν ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ ἰσχυρός. Restore the original (Deut. x. 17) by inserting after κύριος <ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν οὗτος κύριος>.

§ 31, p. 754. φασὶ τοὺς...μάγους...τῶν νεφῶν παράγειν τε ὥδαῖς καὶ θύμασι τῆς ὀργῆς τὴν ἀπειλήν. Place τε after ὥδαῖς.

Ib. Ἐπιμενίδου αἱ θηναῖαι αἱ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὸν Περσικὸν πόλεμον...ὑπερέθεντο. For αὐτοῖς D. reads τοῖς. I should prefer τοῖς αὐτοῖς as the Athenians have been already mentioned in the sentence. [I.B. suggests that Ἀθηναῖος is a gloss.]

Ib. εἰτ' οὖν θεοὺς εἶτε καὶ ἀγγέλους τὰς ψυχὰς ταύτας λέγομεν. We have had no mention of ψυχὰς so far, but only of δυνάμεις employed by God to bring into action the powers of nature. I think ψυχὰς has crept in from the next sentence and ousted δυνάμεις.

§ 32, p. 755. The first sentence of this § is connected with what precedes. The § should begin Δημόκριτος δὲ ἐκ τῆς τῶν μεταρσίῳ παρατηρήσεως, which takes up again φυλάττοντας τὰ μετέωρα at the beginning of § 31.

Ib. συνελόν τοὺς καρποὺς, καὶ γὰρ ὥρα θέρους ἐν ταῖς ἄλυσιν ἐτίησαν, οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι πάντα ἀπώλεσαν. Perhaps we should read συνείλουν (as in Herod. iii. 45 τὰ τέκνα ἐς τὰς νεωσοίκους συν.), and ἐτίθεσαν, the last with Lowth, translating 'those who had taken the advice of Democritus began to gather their fruits together, for they stored them in their garners in the summer' (instead of waiting for the season of harvest).

Ib. ἐωράθη τὸ πῦρ...παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους μυριάδων οὐκ ἔλασσον ἑκατὸν, χωρὶς τῶν ἀφηλίκων ἐκκλησιαζόντων κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου. Insert ὑπὸ before παντὸς, and remove the comma after ἑκατὸν to before μυριάδων, which I take as the subject of ἐκκλ.

§ 34, p. 756. πῶς οὐ δύνατον διάφορον ἦχον ἐξακούεσθαι; For διάφορον read διατόρον.

§ 35, p. 756. εὐροιμεν δ' ἂν καὶ ἄλλο μαρτύριον εἰς βεβαίωσιν τοῦ τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν δογμάτων τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν φιλοσόφων παρ' ἡμῶν σφετερισμένους, ὥσπερ διαυχεῖν τῷ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων βαρβάρων ἀπηνθίσθαι τῶν εἰς ἐκάστην αἵρεσιν συντινόντων τινά. For διαυχεῖν τῷ (*al.* τῶν) read διηχεῖν τὸ, and transfer the comma from before ὥσπερ to after διηχεῖν, translating 'another proof of the philosophers having stolen and transmitted the best of their teaching from us, is that they have also culled from the other barbarians some of the doctrines which go to make up each system of philosophy.' [For ὥσπερ διαυχεῖν I.B. suggests ὡς ἴδια αὐχεῖν, comparing *Strom.* i. p. 377 ἀδικεῖ ὁ σφετερισάμενος τὰ βαρβάρων καὶ ὡς ἴδια αὐχῶν. There can be no doubt that this is the correct reading.]

ὁ ὁροσκόπος ὁρολόγιον τε μετὰ χεῖρα καὶ φοινίκα ἀστρολογίας ἔχων σύμβολα πρόεισιν. Should not we read χεῖρας?

§ 36, p. 757. τοῦτον τὰ τε ἱερογλυφικὰ καλούμενα...χωρογραφίαν τε τῆς Αἰγύπτου...περί τε τῆς καταγραφῆς σκευῆς τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν ἀφιερωμένων αὐτοῖς χωρίων, περί τε μέτρων...εἰδέναι χρή. For σκευῆς read σκευῶν, and put a full stop (instead of a comma) after χρή.

§ In the last sentence of the § some such word as οἶδε or διδάσκει should be supplied before δέκα.

§ 37, p. 758. In the second sentence the clause περιέχει—ἱερέων should be marked as parenthetical.

§ 38, p. 758. τὰ μὲν Αἰγυπτίων ὡς ἐν βραχεὶ φάναι τοσαῦτα. Read τοιαῦτα.

Ib. ἕνα τὸν πρεσβύτερον αὐτῶν ἐπικρίνειν κελύσας. D. reads πρεσβύτατον. I should prefer τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, long and short vowels being continually confused in the MS.

Ib. ὁ δὲ τρίτος (being asked) ποῖόν ἐστι τῶν ζῴων πανουργότατον ὃ μέχρι νῦν οὐκ ἐγνώσθη, ἔπεν, ἄνθρωπος. Put a comma before ὃ and read ἀνθρώποις, 'the most cunning of beasts is that which has up to this time evaded human observation.' Cf. *Plut. V. Alex.* 64, where the answer is given in the words, ὃ μέχρι νῦν ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔγνωκεν.

p. 759. τῶν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρωτήσεων καὶ τὰς ἀποκρίσεις ἀπόρους εἶναι has no meaning

where it stands. If added to the answer of the tenth, ἕτερος ἑτέρου χεῖρον εἶπεν, it might provide some justification for it.

§ 39, p. 759. εἰς θεὸς ἐστίν, ὃς ἀρχὴν ἐποίησεν καὶ τέλος ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, καὶ ὁ ἀόρατος, ὃς τὰ πάντα ὁρᾷ, ἀχώρητος, ὃς τὰ πάντα χωρεῖ, ἀνεπίδεῖς, οὐ τὰ πάντα ἐπιδέεται καὶ δι' ὃν ἐστίν, [ἀκατάληπτος, ἀέναος, ἀφθαρτος,] ἀποίητος, ὃς τὰ πάντα ἐποίησε λόγῳ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ, [τῆς γνωστικῆς γραφῆς], τούτῃ τοῦ υἱοῦ. εἰτα ἐπιφέρει 'τοῦτον τὸν θεὸν σέβεσθε.' For καὶ ὁ read ὁ καί. The adjectives which I have bracketed interrupt the natural sequence of the words, and may possibly have been added in the margin. It is impossible that C. should have used in apposition with δυνάμει the other phrase which I have bracketed. I suspect that it is a mistake for τῇ γνωστικῇ γραφῇ and should be placed after ἐπιφέρει.

p. 760. 'μὴ τοῖνυν' φασὶ 'σέβεσθε.' Read φησὶ, as it is a quotation from the κήρυγμα Πέτρου.

§ 40, p. 760. μὴ ἐπιστάμενοι τὸν θεόν...κατὰ τὴν γνώσιν τὴν τελείαν, ὃν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίας εἰς χρῆσιν, μορφώσαντες ξύλα...καὶ ἀργυρον [τῆς ὕλης αὐτῶν καὶ χρήσεως τὰ δοῦλα τῆς ὑπάρξεως] ἀναστήσαντες σέβονται. Put a full stop after σέβονται instead of Dindorf's comma. The clauses have got misplaced. Insert τὰ δοῦλα τῆς ὑπάρξεως καὶ χρήσεως after τελείαν, and τῆς ὕλης αὐτῶν after χρῆσιν. In the following sentence καὶ ὃ δέδωκεν αὐτοῖς εἰς βρώσιν ὁ θεός, πετεινά...καὶ τῆς γῆς τὰ ἐρπετά [καὶ τὰ θηρία] σὺν κτήνεσι τετραπόδοις τοῦ ἀγροῦ, γαλαῖς τε καὶ μῆλ'...καὶ τὰ ἴδια βρώματα βροτοῖς θύματα θύουσιν, καὶ νεκρά νεκροῖς προσφέροντες ὡς θεοῖς ἀχαριστοῦσι τῷ θεῷ. I think the words in brackets should be placed before γαλαῖς, and καὶ omitted before τὰ ἴδια. Read also βρωτοῖς with Potter.

§ 41, p. 760. καὶ ὅτι γε ὡς τὸν αὐτὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν τε αὐτῶν καὶ Ἑλλήνων ἐγνωκότων φέρεται πλὴν οὐχ ὁμοίως, ἐποίσει πάλιν. For ἐποίσει see my note on v. § 9. Can φέρεται here be taken in the sense 'he proceeds,' 'continues his argument'? Or should we read φέρονται, alluding to the Greeks who are described as ἀγνοοῖ φερόμενοι in § 40?

§ 42, p. 761. Put a full stop after παρ-έστησεν.

Ib. οὐ χρόνῳ διαιρουμένων τῶν τριῶν λαῶν ἵνα τις φύσει ὑπολάβῃ τριττὰς, διαφόροις δὲ παιδευομένων διαθήκαις τοῦ [ἐνὸς κυρίου] ὄντος ἐνὸς κυρίου ῥήματι. I do not think χρόνῳ can be right. The three peoples and dispensations are the Greek, Hebrew and Christian, which differed in point of time, but not in nature and essence. Perhaps we should read οὐχ ὅλως, and omit ἐνὸς κυρίου, comparing note on v. § 1. There should be a

full stop after *ρήματι*. The construction of the following sentence is *ἐπεὶ, ὅτι...ὁ θεὸς...Ἑλλήνων τοὺς δοκιμωτάτους...διέκρινεν, δηλώσει...Παῦλος*. Put a comma, instead of D's full stop, after *διέκρινεν* and *Παῦλος*.

§ 43, p. 762. I am inclined to insert *δε* before *δώδεκα* to mark the contrast between the mission to the Jews which was to be continued for twelve years and that to the Gentiles afterwards.

§ 44, p. 762. *ἐξέλθετε, εἶπεν, ἐκ τῶν δεσμῶν οἱ θέλοντες, τοὺς ἐκονσίως δεδεμένους, καὶ τὰ δυσβάστακτα φορτία, φησὶν, αὐτοῖς...ἐπαναθεμένους λέγων*. Omit the comma after *δεδεμένους*, read *αὐτοῖς* for *αὐτοῖς* and put *φησὶν* in brackets to show that it has merely an adverbial force, meaning 'in these very words.'

Ιβ. οὐχ ἡ πίστις μόνον ἡ εἰς τὸν κύριον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἀποστήναι τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας ἔδει. Should we not read here *ἔλειπε* as in the previous clause?

§ 45, p. 763. *ἐπεὶ τίς ἂν εὖ φρονῶν ἐν μιᾷ καταδίκη καὶ τὰς τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ὑπολάβοι εἶναι ψυχὰς, ἀδικίαν τῆς προνοίας καταχέων*; Put a full stop before *ἐπεὶ*. Insert the words *καὶ τὰς τῶν δικαίων* after *καταδίκη*. They appear in Potter's text without remark, but are omitted, doubtless through carelessness, by Klotz, whom Dindorf follows.

Ιβ. οὐχὶ δηλοῦσιν εὐηγγελίσθαι τὸν κύριον τοῖς τε ἀπολωλόσιν ἐν τῷ κατακλυσμῷ, [μᾶλλον δὲ πεπεδημένοις] καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ τε καὶ φρουρᾷ συνεχομένοις; δέδεικται δὲ...καὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἀκολουθῶν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τοῖς ἐν "Αἰδοι εὐηγγελισμένοις. Put the words in brackets after *συνεχομένοις*. As *εὐηγγελίσθαι* governs the dative in the earlier sentence, it seems better to read *τοῖς* for *τοῖς* in the later.

§ 46, p. 763. *εἰ γοῦν ὁ κύριος δι' οὐδὲν ἕτερον εἰς "Αἶδον κατήλθεν ἢ διὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίσασθαι ὡς πᾶρ κατήλθεν, ἦτοι πάντας εὐαγγελίσασθαι ἢ μόνους Ἑβραίους*. For *ὡς περ* read *ἐφ' οὗπερ*, and insert a third *κατήλθεν* after the second *εὐαγγελίσασθαι*. In the next sentence the construction would be made clearer by putting a bracket before *ἐπεὶ* and after *αἰρούμενα*.

§ 47, p. 764. *εἰ γὰρ τὸ καλῶς βιοῦν καὶ νομίμως ἐστὶ βιοῦν, [καὶ τὸ εἰλόγως βιοῦν κατὰ νόμον ἐστὶ βιοῦν]*. ὁρθῶς δὲ βεβιωκότες οἱ πρὸ νόμου εἰς πίστιν ἐλογίσθησαν καὶ δίκαιοι εἶναι ἐκρίθησαν, δηλὸν πον καὶ τοὺς ἐκτὸς νόμου γενομένους...πιστεῦσαι. I think the words in brackets are merely an alternative reading, which has crept in from the margin. Put a comma instead of a full stop before *ὁρθῶς*. The apodosis begins with *δηλὸν πον*.

Ιβ. οὕτως οἶμαι δέκνυσθαι ἀγαθὸν μὲν τὸν θεόν, δυνατόν δὲ τὸν κύριον, σώζειν...εἴτε ἐνταῦθα εἴτε καὶ ἀλλαχόθι. Remove the comma after *κύριον*. For *ἐνεργητική* just below I should read *ἐνεργετική*, as also in § 52, where it is joined with *παιδευτικόν*.

§ 48, p. 765. In a quotation from the *Κήρυγμα Πέτρον* Christ is introduced as giving his Apostles charge to preach *διὰ [τοῦ Χριστοῦ] πίστεως ἐμῆς δηλοῦντας τὰ μέλλοντα*. Here I think *τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is a marginal gloss to explain *ἐμῆς*.

§ 49, p. 765. The clause *εἰς δὲ οὗτος—σωθῆσόμενοι* explanatory of *τοῦ οὐρίου* should be put in brackets, so as not to interrupt the connexion between the preceding and the following clauses.

§ 50, p. 766. Put a full stop after *ἡ γραφή*, and colons after *ὁ βοῦς* and *ἀγρίον θηρίον*.

Ιβ. μεταβαλόντες μέντοι ἐκ τοῦ εἶναι θηρία διὰ τῆς κυριακῆς πίστεως ἄνθρωποι γίνονται θεοῦ [τὴν ἀρχὴν] ἐκ τοῦ θελήσαι μεταβάλλεσθαι εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι προκόπτοντες. I think *τὴν ἀρχὴν* would come more naturally after *θηρία*.

§ 51, p. 766. *Δαβὶδ φησιν εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐνεπαύσαν ἔθνη ἐν διαφθορᾷ ἢ ἐποίησαν...ἀλλὰ ἐγένετο κύριος καταφυγὴ τῷ πένητι*. *εἰ δὲ* is not a part of the quotation. Should we read *ἰδε*, which occurs in the preceding verse of Ps. ix. and makes equally good sense?

§ 52. τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ παιδευτικὸν καὶ ἐνεργητικὸν τύχχανον. Read here, with Sylburg, *ἐνεργετικόν*, as in § 47.

Ιβ. ἡ ψυχὴ οὐκ ἂν πρὸ παχυμέστερον ὕδατος πάθοι τι δεινόν. Read *πρὸς*.

Ιβ. Valentinus (τῶν τὴν κοινότητα πρεσβευόντων ὁ κορυφαῖος) is quoted as saying πολλὰ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν ταῖς δημοσίαις βίβλοις εὑρίσκειται γεγραμμένα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ· τὰ γὰρ κενὰ ταῦτα ἐστὶ τὰ ἀπὸ καρδίας ῥήματα· νόμος ὁ γραπτὸς ἐν καρδίᾳ κ.τ.λ. For the unmeaning *κενὰ* read *κοινὰ*, the 'common truths' of the *anima naturaliter Christiana*.

§ 53, p. 767. οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν αὐτῶν εἶρημα. τῶν δὲ προφητῶν σφετερισάμενοι προσέθηκαν τῷ μὴ ὑπάρχοντι κατ' αὐτοὺς σοφῷ. Read τὰ μὴ ὑπάρχοντα (or perhaps better τὸ μὴ ὑπάρχον) τῷ κατ' αὐτοὺς σοφῷ.

§ 54, p. 767. τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, ὡς πάλαι παρεσημειωσάμεθα, οὐ τὴν κατὰ ἐκάστην αἴρεσιν ἀγωγὴν φάμεν, ἀλλ', ὅπερ ὄντως ἐστὶ φιλοσοφία, ὁρθῶς [σοφίαν] τεχνικὴν τὴν ἐμπειρίαν παρέχουσαν τῶν περὶ τὸν βίον, τὴν δὲ σοφίαν ἐμπεδὸν γνῶσιν θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων κ.τ.λ. It is evident that here and in what follows a broad distinction is made between *σοφία* and *φιλοσοφία*, but this is confused by the

insertion of the word σοφίαν in the clause which treats of φιλοσοφία. I believe it to be merely a marginal correction changing the wrong reading (φιλοσοφία) into the right reading (φιλοσοφίαν). The construction will be made clear by putting a comma after ἐστὶ.

Ib. καὶ ἔστιν ἀμετάπτωτος ὑπὸ λόγου παραδοθεῖσα, ταύτῃ καὶ πάντως ἀληθὴς ὑπάρχει [βουλήσει], ὥς διὰ τοῦ νοῦ ἐγνωσμένη. Insert <θεία> βουλήσει after παραδοθεῖσα, and either put a colon before ταύτῃ or insert ἡ before ἔστιν.

Ib. ἡ μὲν μία καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ, αἱ δὲ πολλαὶ καὶ ἀδιάφοροι. Read διάφοροι, 'the wisdom of Christ is one and the same, human systems are many and diverse.'

§ 55, p. 768. ταύτης οὖν τῆς σοφίας ἐπιθυμεῖ ἡ φιλοσοφία τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τῆς ὀρθότητος τοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς τοῦ βίου καθαρότητος. Here we seem to have the usual triple division of philosophy into physics, logic, and ethics. Should we read <περί τε> τῆς φυσικῆς, or has more been lost, and should we prefix to this, τῆς ψυχῆς <οὐσα περιαγωγή>?

§ 56, p. 768. ὥς ἡ γεωμετρία περὶ μέτρα καὶ μεγέθη καὶ σχήματα πραγματευομένη [διὰ τῆς ἐν τοῖς ἐπιπέδοις καταγραφῆς], ἡ τε ζωγραφία τὸν ὀπτικὸν ὅλον τόπον ἐπὶ τῶν σκηνογραφουμένων φαίνεται παραλαμβάνουσα, ταύτης δὲ ψευδογραφεῖ τὴν ὄψιν τοῖς κατὰ προσβολὴν τῶν ὀπτικῶν γραμμῶν σημείοις χρωμένη κατὰ τὸ τεχνικόν, ἐντεῦθεν ἐπιφάσεις καὶ ὑποθέσεις καὶ φάσεις σώζονται, καὶ τὰ μὲν δοκεῖ προῦχειν, τὰ δὲ ἴσχειν, τὰ δὲ ἄλλως πως φαντάζεσθαι ἐν τῷ ὁμαλῷ καὶ λείῳ, οὕτω δὲ καὶ οἱ φιλόσοφοι ζωγραφίας δίκην ἀπομιμνῶνται τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Here the representation of truth given by philosophy is compared to the representations of reality by geometry and painting. The first difficulty is in the word ταύτης, which has nothing to refer to, the nearest feminine (ζωγραφία) being the subject of the verb. We may remedy this by transferring the words in brackets and putting them after παραλαμβάνουσα, translating 'gives a false effect to the appearance of this (the drawing on the flat) by an artistic use of the laws of perspective.' Compare Aristotle's use of the word ὄψις for stage scenery (*Poet.* 6). If we read ἐντεῦθεν, we must put a colon before it, but I should prefer ἔθεν. What is meant by ἐπιφάσεις, ὑποθέσεις, φάσεις? They seem to denote some sort of illusion produced by following the rules of perspective. But what relation has ὑποθέσεις to φάσεις and ἐπιφάσεις? Should we not read ὑποφάσεις, giving us three degrees of prominence, corresponding perhaps to our

fore-ground, back-ground and middle distance? The words προῦχειν and ἴσχειν can only mean 'to project' and 'to recede,' for which Philostratus (*V. Apoll.* ii. 20, p. 33 Kayser) uses the words τὸ εἰσέχον τε καὶ ἐξέχον in reference to Zeuxis and Polygnotus. Compare also Sext. Emp. *P.H.* i. 92 αἱ γοῦν γραφαὶ τῇ μὲν ὄψει δοκοῦσιν εἰσοχὰς καὶ ἐξοχὰς ἔχειν, οὐ μὴν καὶ τῇ ἀφῇ. Read therefore εἰσέχειν for ἴσχειν. Put a full stop after ἀλήθειαν. [I am glad to be able to quote Prof. Helbig in support of the above conjectures. In a letter to Mr. Cecil Smith, who had kindly consulted him in my behalf, he says 'Die Conjecturen εἰσέχειν und ὑποφάσεις scheinen mir evident. Zwar kann ich das letztere Wort nicht in der von Herrn M. eingenommenen Bedeutung nachweisen. Doch ergibt sich die Berechtigung seiner Auffassung aus der ἐπιφάσεις und φάσεις.']

§ 57, p. 769. εἰ γοῦν τις...τύχη καὶ τὸ δοῦλον ὡς κύριον καὶ ἡ γεμονεῖται, σφάλεται. Read εἰν for εἰ, and ἡγεμόνα ἡγήται. [I prefer now I.B.'s suggestion, ἂν οὖν for εἰ γοῦν, and ἡγεμόνα οἴηται, which accords with the word οἴησις below.]

Ib. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀγγέλων τις, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὡς μνησύνουσιν οἱ ἀγγελοι...οὕτως ἀκούουσιν ἄνθρωποι, οὐδ' ὡς ἡμῖν τὰ ὅσα οὕτως ἐκείνοις ἡ γλῶττα. For the 2nd and 3rd οὐδὲ read οὔτε.

Ib. πολλοῦ γε δεῖ, τὸν θεὸν ἐμβοᾶν ἀπροσίτῳ ἀγίῳτι καὶ ἀρχαγγέλων αὐτὸν κεχωρισμένον. Put a full stop before πολλοῦ and remove the comma after δεῖ. Read αὐτὸν for αὐτόν, as suggested by Sylburg.

§ 58, p. 769. ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐν μὲν τὸ ἀγέννητον...ἐν δὲ καὶ τὸ προγεννηθέν...('εἰς γὰρ τῷ ὄντι ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, ὃς ἀρχὴν τῶν πάντων ἐποίησεν,' μνησύνων τὸν πρωτόγονον νῖον, ὃ Πέτρος γράφει, συνεῖς ἀκριβῶς τὸ 'ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν' σοφία δ' οὗτος εἴρηται πρὸς πάντων τῶν προφητῶν), οὕτως ἐστὶν ὁ τῶν γενητῶν πάντων διδάσκαλος. So I should stop this, beginning the apodosis with οὕτως. The editors put a full stop after γῆν and προφητῶν.

Ib. κἂν ὁ νόμος εἰκὼν καὶ σκιὰ τῆς ἀληθείας τυγχάνῃ, σκιὰ γὰρ ὁ νόμος τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλ' ἡ φιλαυτία κ.τ.λ. For the 2nd τῆς ἀληθείας, which is merely a repetition, read τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, a quotation from Heb. x. 1.

§ 59, p. 770. Omit ἡ before δικαιούσα. Both this and the following participle explain the mode of action of διδασκαλία.

Ib. εἰ δ' ἐκ τινος ποιήσεως τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας, ὅτῳ δὴ ποτε τρόπῳ λαβόντες σπέρματα, οὐκ ἐξέθρεψάν τινες, γῇ δὲ ἀγόνῳ καὶ ἀνομβρίᾳ παραδεδωκότες ἀγρίαις συνεπνέξαντο βοτάναις κ.τ.λ. For ποιήσεως read

παιδεύσεως, for ἀνομβρία perhaps ἀνόμβρω. Shortly after put a full stop after προφη- μένοι.

§ 60, p. 770. ἦτοι ὡς ἄργυρος... καθίσταται ὁ δίκαιος... ἦ, ἐπεὶ καὶ Σολῶμων λέγει 'γλώσσαν δίκαιον ἄργυρον πεπυρωμένον,' τὴν δεδοκιμασμένην καὶ σοφὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐπαινετὴν... τυγχάνειν μηνύων, ὅταν... πολυτρόπως ἡ γνωστικὴ ψυχὴ ἀγιάζεται κατὰ τὴν ἀποχὴν τῶν γεωδῶν πυρώσεων. For τυγχάνειν read τυγχάνει, the subject being the verse of Prov. x. quoted at the end of § 59. Put a full stop

after πυρώσεων, and below after νεὼ and τελείωσις αὐτῇ.

[Ib. ὁ δὲ ἐν τῷ σώματι καθαρισμὸς τῆς ψυχῆς πρώτης πρώτος οὗτός ἐστιν, ἡ ἀποχὴ τῶν κακῶν. I.B. proposes to bracket πρώτης.]

§ 61, p. 771. ἡ γνώσις δὲ αὐτῇ ἡ κατὰ διαδοχὰς... παραδοθεῖσα κατελήλυνεν. Omit ἡ.

§ 63, p. 772. κυρίας εἶναι τὰς διαθήκας ὁμολογῆται. I think we should insert δ' after κυρίας.

J. B. MAYOR.

(To be continued.)

HORATIANA.

1. *Carm.* iii. 23. 16.

*immunis aram si tetigit manus,
non sumptuosa blandior hostia
mollivit aversos penatis
farre pio et saliente mica.*

It will be remembered that the preceding stanzas are to the following effect: 'The victim that browses on Algidus or the Alban pastures may fall to the axe of the pontifices. It is no business of yours, Phidyle, to importune your little gods with sacrifice of sheep.' The meaning of the emphatic *immunis*, which follows, has caused much difficulty. Orelli, after Acron and Porphyryon, interpreted it as 'innocent,' deriving this meaning partly from the etymology (as if *immunis* meant 'owing nothing') and partly from such phrases as *immunis delictorum*. This interpretation is generally rejected both as improbable in itself and also because Horace twice elsewhere (*C.* iv. 12. 23 and *Epp.* i. 14. 33) uses *immunis* in the sense of 'without a gift.' The latter meaning is adopted by Nauck, Schütz, Wickham, Page, Kiessling and Keller (in the *Epilegomena*). Wickham's translation therefore (barring a difference as to the case of *hostia*) may be regarded as generally approved. It runs: 'Though thy hand when it was laid on the altar held no gift, it has softened the displeasure of the Penates with the pious offering of meal and crackling salt, and could please no more with a costly victim.' But in this version there are two grave difficulties, viz. (1) why should *manus* mean 'thy hand,' and (2) how can a hand, which offers *mola salsa*, be described as bringing no gift at all? Kiessling, indeed, suggests that *immunis* means 'ohne grosse Gaben,'

but the word is emphatic and not to be trifled with. I would suggest that the meaning here is still the etymological one of *sine munere*, but in the sense 'without office' and so 'unofficial,' 'private,' 'lay,' in contrast with the official *pontifices* previously mentioned. This is only a quaint extension of the sense 'discharging no duties' which is well attested. Thus Paulus (p. 143 Müll.) quotes Festus *immunis dicitur qui nullo fungitur officio*. Plautus, in a punning passage (*Trin.* ii. 2. 69—73), has *is est immunis quod nihil est qui munus fungatur suum*. See also Conington's note on *Georgic* iv. 244 *immunisque sedens aliena ad pabula fucus*. The translation 'if it be a layman's hand that touches the altar' seems to be warrantable in itself and to satisfy all the requirements of the order and context.

2. *Carm.* ii. 9. 17—24.

*desine mollium
tandem querellarum et potius nova
cantemus Augusti tropaea
Caesaris et rigidum Niphaten
Medumque flumen gentibus additum
victis minores volvere vertices
intraque praescriptum Gelonos
exiguus equitare campis.*

These lines are of great importance because they are the mainstay of those editors and critics who reject the general opinion that *Carm.* i.—iii. were published in B.C. 23 and maintain that they were published in B.C. 19. But in all the discussions the passage has provoked, no attention has been paid to the word *tropaea*, which is commonly supposed to be a mere synonym for 'triumphs' or 'victories.' I propose to contend that the *nova tropaea*

Augusti Caesaris, named here with so much formality, were a monument either voted to Augustus by the senate, or at least projected, in B.C. 25, and that the other allusions are appropriate to that year—a year very memorable otherwise from the certain facts that Augustus was then saluted Imperator for the eighth time, was then offered his second triumph and then, for the second time, closed the temple of Janus. It is more convenient to take Horace's allusions in the reverse order.¹

(1). Very little is known of the Geloni, but it is easier to connect them with B.C. 25 than with B.C. 19. They seem to be identical with the Sarmatae, a Scythian people living on both sides of the Tanais (*R. G.*² p. 134: cf. *Carm.* iii. 4. 35 *visam pharetratos Gelonos et Scythicum inviolatus amnem*). It would appear from *Carm.* ii. 11. 1 (*quid bellicosus Cantaber et Scythes* etc.) that the Cantabri and the Scythians were giving trouble at the same time and Orosius (6. 21. 19) says that an embassy from the Scythians reached Augustus at Tarraco, where he lay ill during the Cantabrian campaign. This would be in B.C. 26—25. We gather also, from the epitome of Livy 134 and 135, that M. Licinius Crassus was at this time finishing the long campaign in Eastern Europe which began in B.C. 29 (*R. G.*² pp. 12, 133 134).

(2). Niphates is a mountain-range in Armenia, from which the Tigris and a large tributary of the Euphrates flow. Historians record continual Roman interference in Armenia from B.C. 36 to 30, but not again till B.C. 20, when Tiberius made a great expedition into the country. The expedition was invited by the Armenians themselves, who complained of their king Artaxes and asked for his brother Tigranes, who was in Rome (Dio C. liv. 9). The situation suggests that the Romans had already exercised authority in the country and this suggestion is borne out by coins. There is (or appears to be) a series of silver denarii bearing a head of Augustus on the obverse and on the reverse an Armenian standing, wearing a pileus and holding a spear and bow. The inscriptions on the reverses are (a) *Caesar Divi F. Armen. Recep. Imp. VII.* (b) *Caesar Divi F. Armen. Capt. Imp. VIII.* and (c) *Caesar Divi F. Armen. Capt. Imp. VIII.* These dates correspond to B.C. 29—25 (*Imp. VII.*),

25—19 (*Imp. VIII.*) and 19—15 (*Imp. VIII.*). Mommsen (*R. G.*² p. 13) suggests that the inscription was in each case intended for *Imp. VIII.* Mr. H. A. Grueber, however, who kindly showed me the two specimens in the British Museum, allows me to say that, in his opinion, one coin in our collection inscribed *Imp. VIII.* is certainly well-struck (though the other is doubtful). The title *Imp. VIII.* might have been used any time between B.C. 25 and B.C. 19, but it seems unlikely that two sets of coins, one bearing *Imp. VIII.* and the other *Imp. VIII.*, were struck to commemorate the same campaign of B.C. 20. Augustus deliberately exaggerated the importance of his dealings with Armenia, Media and Parthia, and would have inscribed *Armenia Capta* on a coin with very small provocation. I suggest that he had some transaction with Armenia about B.C. 25 (cf. the quotation from *Georgic* iii. below) and that disturbances ensued which led to the expedition of B.C. 20.

(3). The word *tropaeum* (usually in plur. *tropaea*) means, in Augustan poets, almost always a 'trophy,' a substantial monument, and not a 'victory' in the abstract. The word was familiar to the Romans from the *Tropaea Marii*, a monument commemorating the victory over the Cimbri, which Sulla destroyed and Julius Caesar restored (Suet. *Iul.* 2). Of Pompey also Sallust says (*Hist.* iv. 26 Dietsch) *devictis Hispanis tropaea in Pyrenaeis iugis constituit*. The expression in Horace *nova tropaea Augusti Caesaris* would naturally refer to some such monument. Now Dion (liii. 26. 4. 5) has the following passage relating to B.C. 25: ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον χρόνον Μάρκος Οὐνίκιος, Κελτῶν τινὰς μετελθὼν, ὅτι Ῥωμαίους ἀνδρας ἐς τὴν χώραν σφῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐπιμίξιν ἐσελθόντας συλλαβόντες ἐφθειραν, τὸ ὄνομα καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος τῷ Αὐγούστῳ ἔδωκε. καὶ ἐψηφίσθη μὲν πον καὶ τὰ ἐπινίκια αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς τότε γενομένοις· ἐπεὶ δ' οὐκ ἠθέλησεν αὐτὰ πέμψαι ἅψις τε ἐν ταῖς Ἀλπεσι τροπαιοφόρος αὐτῷ ὑποδομήθη καὶ ἐξουσία ἐδόθη τοῦ τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ ἔτους ἡμέρᾳ καὶ τῷ στεφάνῳ καὶ τῇ ἐσθῇ τῇ νικητηρίᾳ αἰεὶ χρῆσθαι.

Mommsen is now (see *R. G.*² p. 104 and *C. I. L.* v. pp. 757 and 907) of opinion that the triumphal arch mentioned by Dion is that which is still standing (though the inscription is lost) at Aosta, *Augusta Praetorianorum*, founded in B.C. 25 after the victory of Terentius Varro over the Salassi. But formerly (*R. G.*¹ p. 71) Mommsen believed that Dion made a mistake or

¹ In what follows, references to *R. G.* are intended for Mommsen's edition of the *Monumentum Ancytanum, Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. 1st ed. 1865, 2nd ed. 1883.

the senate changed its mind and that the monument was not an arch but the great tower known to Pliny (*H. N.* iii. 20. 136) and to Ptolemy (iii. 1. 2) as *Tropaea Augusti* and still called *Turbia* or *La Turbie*. The remains of it are familiar to visitors to Nice and Monte Carlo. It appears to have been originally a huge cylindrical pedestal, decorated with statues and trophies in niches and surmounted by a statue of Augustus. The inscription, except a few fragments, is lost, but a copy of it is preserved by Pliny (*loc. cit.* *C. I. L.* v. 7817). From this it appears that the monument was finished B.C. 7—6 (*imp.* XIII. *trib. pot.* XVII.) but it might have been projected much earlier, just as the temple of Mars Ultor, vowed in B.C. 42, was not finished till B.C. 2.

The coincidence of the name of this monument, *tropaea Augusti*, with the language of Horace is very striking, but it is not necessary for me to dispute Mommson's present opinion. It will be sufficient if I adduce literary evidence that a temple or other great monument to Augustus, to be called *tropaea*, was projected some time before Vergil's death. In the first place, it is noticeable that the word *tropaeum* or *tropaea* occurs seven times in *Aeneid* x. and xi. but not elsewhere in Vergil's works, except at *Georg.* iii. 32 in a passage which is certainly a later addition to the poem. It is a reasonable inference that *tropaeum* was a fashionable word at the time when Vergil was writing the first draft of *Aen.* x. and xi. Again, the passage in *Georg.* iii. 12—34 is a description of a temple which Vergil imagined himself building to Augustus in Mantua. The doors of it were

to be carved with symbols of Augustus' victories. The poet continues:

*Addam urbes Asiae domitas, pulsumque
Niphaten
fidemtemque fuga Parthum versisque sagittis,
et duo rapta manu diverso ex hoste tropaea
bisque triumphatas utroque ab littore gentes.*

The last two lines surely refer to the fact that in B.C. 25 Augustus was offered his second triumph for victories in the West, whereas in B.C. 29 his triumph was for victories in the East. Again, the poems in Propertius' Fourth Book fall between the dates B.C. 28 and 23 (Postgate, *Select Elegies*, p. liii.). The elegy to Maecenas (iv. 8) contains the following lines:

*Caesaris et famae vestigia iuncta tenebis:
Maecenatis erunt vera tropaea fides.*

The suggestion seems to be that Caesar had, or was to have, his substantial *tropaea*, but that Maecenas would have *tropaea* of another kind. His loyalty was to be his monument. Compare also another poem (iv. 2) of Propertius, written about B.C. 25:

*Arma deus Caesar dices meditatatur ad
Indos
Tigris et Euphrates sub sua iura fluent:
Sera, sed Ausoniis veniet provincia virgis:
Adsuescent Latio Partha tropaea Iovi.*

I could add more quotations, but it might be said that I approach them with prepossessions and see in them more than the words warrant.

JAMES GOW.

CATULLIANA.

- XII. 6. Non credis mihi? crede Pollioni
Fratri, qui tua furta vel talento
Mutari velit: est enim leporum
Disertus puer ac facetiarum.

MUNRO's *ducentum* for *disertus* has not found general favour, and the Horatian *centum puer artium* is perhaps rather against than for it. Horace would have been following Catullus too closely. Nor would *ducentum* yield just the sense wanted, which is not the abundant humour of Pollio but the good taste by which that

humour is controlled. Is it possible that *decentum* is the word which Catullus used? Munro's argument shows how the corruption would occur and for the form of the word cf. xxxiv. 12 *amniunumque sonantum*.

- XXX. 3. Iam me prodere, iam non dubitas
fallere, perfide?
Num facta impia fallacum homi-
num caelicolis placent?
Que tu neglegis ac me miserum
deseris in malis.

Que in line 5 has been turned by various editors to *quae*, *quos*, *quem*, and *quom*. Perhaps it stands for *queis* = *quibus*, agreeing with *malis* and forming an exclamation. So in lxiv. 31 L. Müller reads *queis* for *que*.

XXXVI. 9. Et hoc pessima se puella vidit
Locose lepide vovere divis.

Lesbia had vowed that she would offer to the god of fire *electissima pessimi poetae scripta*. To call her *pessima puella* just after recording this would surely be awkward: the word *pessimus* ought not to recur immediately in another application. *Et haec pessima*, in which *pessima* agrees with *haec*, gets over this difficulty, but leaves a poor and obscure meaning. Borrowing Mr. Postgate's *sic* for *se* and the old emendation *ioco se lepido* I suggest

Acceptissima sic puella vidit
Ioco se lepido vovere divis.

Acceptum face redditumque votum in 16 perhaps supports this.

LXI. 21. Floridis velut enitens
Myrtus Asia ramulis,
Quos Hamadryades deae
Ludicrum sibi rosido
Nutriunt umore.

The substitution of a spondee for a dactyl in the pherecratean may no doubt be paralleled not only by the spondees for dactyls in the hendecasyllabic poem LV (*Oramus si forte non molestumst*) but by Seneca's spondaic glyconics in *Oedipus* 903-935, e.g. *tuta me media rehat | vita decurrens via*. But what still justifies some doubt is the fact that in the forty or fifty pherecrateans of this poem we find the spondee only once. In LV and in the *Oedipus* it occurs many times. Is it likely that in a long poem Catullus would use the licence (unknown to Greek writers?) once and once only, and that without being pressed by a proper name or some other great difficulty? He had only to write *nutriente liquore*.

71-73. Quae tuis careat sacris
Non queat dare praesides
Terra finibus.

This and the two preceding stanzas are made so closely to correspond that, as the others both begin with the negative, we may perhaps ask whether lines 71 and 72 should not change places.

NO. LXXX. VOL. IX.

76-78. Claustra pandite ianuae:
Virgo adest. Viden ut faces
Splendidas quatiant comas?

Mr. Ellis retains *adest* with all the MSS., but most recent edd. seem to adopt Schrader's *ades*, making *virgo* vocative. Line 231 *claudite ostia, virgines*, suggests that we should perhaps read *virgines* here. There is no difficulty arising from the *viden* following: cf. lxii. 6-8.

LXIII. 50 Patria o mei creatrix, patria o
mea genetrix.

Perhaps *mea creatrix*. *Mei* may be due to some one who had not noticed that Catullus writes *Propontidā trucem* (iv. 9), *impotentia freta* (ib. 18), *ultimā Britannia* (xxix. 4). Those other passages did not lend themselves to change.

53-4. Ut apud nivem et ferarum gelida
stabula forem
Et earum omnia adirem furibunda
latibula.

Line 54 has two grievous blots. In the first place, though the point is disputed, I feel convinced that *omnia adirem* is metrically impossible. Secondly the feeble and superfluous *earum* should long ago have been called in question and expelled. How then shall we restore the line? I conjecture that *earum* has taken the place of an imperfect subjunctive, and further that the word probably began with a long syllable, because otherwise no verse between 40 (*lustravit*) and 67 (*linguendum*) starts with two long syllables, and this would be a much longer interval than ordinary. In the first seventeen lines of the poem there are three so beginning. It is very probable then that Catullus used here a favourite word of his and wrote *et viserem omnia*. Cf. Prop. 1. 1, 12 *ibat et hirsutus ille videre feras*, where *videre* need not have been questioned. *Adirem*, which there is strong metrical reason for suspecting, may stand for *ardens*, and the line will run
Et viserem omnia ardens furibunda latibula.

It is immaterial to my conjecture whether *furibunda* is feminine singular or neuter plural, but I am inclined to agree with those who make it the former: cf. 68. The *miser* of 51 refers to another day.

75. Geminas deorum ad auris nova nuntia
referens.

Exception seems rightly taken to this on the grounds that not the gods in general but Cybele alone should be mentioned, and that a phrase like *geminæ aures* is only used with reference to one person.

Although *geminæ* looks, as Munro says, genuine, it may be just worth while to suggest *dominae deorum* or *dearum* as a possible reading. Cybele is especially known as *domina* (cf. lines 13 and 91 of this poem, Virg. *Aen.* 3, 113, Ap. Rhod. 1, 1125 *μητέρα Διὸς ἑοῦσαν πολυπότνιαν*): and *domina deorum* (*dearum*) would correspond to the *πότνια θεῶων* of the Greeks.

LXIV. 16. Illa atque (haud) alia viderunt
luce marinas
Mortales oculis nudato corpore
nymphas.

So Ellis after Bergk, but the MSS. have only *illa atque alia*. Munro (*quaque alia*?). Reise, pointing out that the negative notion is inconsistent with many myths, proposes to read *illa felici*. *Illi tranquilla* would be a good deal nearer to the MSS.

LXVI. 11. Qua rex tempestate novo auctus
hymenaeo
Vastatum fines iverat Assy-
rios.

If *novo auctus hymenaeo* is right, we should probably take *hymenaeo* in the sense of 'marriage-song,' for it is doubtful whether in the singular it can mean 'marriage.' In lxiv. 20 and 141 Catullus uses the plural. No doubt *auctus* might go with the song as in lxiv. 25 it goes with the torches (*taedis felicibus aucte*). But the unusual hiatus sets us thinking whether we should not write *novis auctus hymenaeis*. All other apparent cases of such hiatus in Catullus may be confidently put down to corruption; some however of Virgil's lines make one feel less certain about this particular instance.

XC. Nascatur magus ex Gelli matrisque
nefando
Coniugio et discat Persicum aru-
spicium:
Nam magus ex matre et gnato gignatur
oportet,
Si vera est Persarum impia religio.

Should we not read *nascetur* and *discet*?

HERBERT RICHARDS.

NOTES ON THE WASPS OF ARISTOPHANES.

341 sqq.

ταῦτ' ἐτόλμησ' ὁ μιὰρὸς χα-
νείν ὁ δημολογοκλέων ὁ δ'
ὅτι λέγεις σύ τι περὶ τῶν νε-
ῶν ἀληθές.

As the text stands ὁ δημολογοκλέων must be in apposition to ὁ μιὰρὸς, that is, Bdelycleon. I neither see why such an epithet as *δημολογοκλέων* should be applied to Bdelycleon, nor why the Chorus at this point should use any epithet containing an indirect reflection on Cleon. Read, I think,

ταῦτ' ἐτόλμησ' ὁ μιὰρὸς χα-
νείν; ὁ Δημολογοκλέων οἷδ'
ὅτι λέγεις σύ τι περὶ τῶν νε-
ῶν ἀληθές.

'Did the wretch dare to utter this? Our great popular mouthpiece Cleon knows that you are bringing a charge against our youths that is only too true.' Bentley's correction *νέων* for *νεῶν* must be accepted.

In the place where I read οἷδε for ὅδε the

metre will bear either a long or short syllable; in the line that answers to it (v. 373) the corresponding syllable is long.

539. The passage vv. 525—545 corresponds metrically to vv. 631—647. In the antistrophe the chorus is twice interrupted by couplets given to Philocleon. We might expect that in the strophe we should have two interrupting couplets given to Bdelycleon. The first couplet, 529, 530, is indeed given to him; but the next is divided between Bdelycleon and Philocleon, and, as the text stands, must be so divided. I am convinced, however, that in v. 539 we should read

τί γὰρ φάβ' ὑμεῖς ἦν ὁδὶ μ' ἢ τῷ λόγῳ κρατήσῃ;

giving both verses 538 and 539 to the young man. In the former couplet (529, 530) the first line is addressed to a slave; in the second line he turns to his father. At v. 538 he recurs to the matter of taking notes, and then turns to the *Chorus*: 'what do you say if my father doesn't get the best of

it, after all?' *μή* and *με* are again confused at v. 1091.

v. 1291.

It is most noticeable how in the parabasis (1037) the poet declares that he always has fought and still fights against Cleon—

ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔτι καὶ νυνὶ πολεμεῖ.

This must be taken in connection with the passage vv. 1284–1291. The lost antistrophe preceding these lines Blaydes, following Bergk, supposes, no doubt rightly, to have contained a savage attack on Cleon. In line 1291 Cleon is undoubtedly the vine, and the poet the faithless *χάραξ*. The strong references to the poet's personality at these places make it difficult to believe that the play can have been brought out in any other name than his own.

The words that follow v. 1037 are most interesting, and appear to me to be a deliberate attempt to prove that even the *Clouds* was really an attack on Cleon and his allies. We read of certain persons who dreading legal proceedings sprang up in haste and came before the polemarch. Why before the polemarch? Because he was the magistrate before whom a man would go who was threatened with a *γραφὴ ξενίας*, who felt his claim of citizenship to be shaky, and therefore was fain to accept the position of a *μέτοικος* and get the polemarch to appoint a *προστάτης* for him [Aristotle, *Αθ. Πολ.* ch. 58].

The prosecution of Aristophanes for *ξενία* was probably only one of many. The purification of the register was always a note of the democrats, being indeed rendered necessary by the system of state-payments (cf. v. 718 *ξενίας φεύγων*), and was one of the first acts of the restored democracy in the archonship of Eucleides. By whom are those persons who go before the polemarch assailed? By certain new

diseases in the state, 'agues and fevers'; the representatives of the New Studies. These persons teach utter disregard of obligation to parents; that is a point that comes out in the *Clouds* clearly enough. But they are next said to have a further position. They furnish weapons to the democratic prosecutor. This is a point that does not come out so clearly in the *Clouds*, as we have the play. But Aristophanes seems here to try to enlarge the class of persons attacked in the *Clouds*. He attacked Socrates and the Sophists, he says, not merely as teachers of bad morality, but also as persons who made the worse cause prevail by training democratic *συνήγοροι* in the arts of law and rhetoric. For the reasons I have tried to set forth I should certainly follow the MS. reading *μετ' αὐτοῦ* in 1037, instead of reading *μετ' αὐτῶν* with Meineke &c. It is together with Cleon that (as Arist. would have us believe) the Sophists were attacked in the *Clouds*.

1050. τὴν ἐπίνοιαν ξυνέτριψεν.

τὴν ἐπίνοιαν is *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*; but we often find that words thus introduced have a *likeness* in sound to the word that would have been expected, and this likeness sometimes amounts to an actual pun. I think there may have been a word *ἐπιχνοία* derived from *χρῶα* meaning the covering of the axle-ends.

1119. Three *μήτε*'s in succession appear to be not frequent, and the putting of *φλύκτανα* on a par with *κώπη* and *λόγχην* seems pointless. I strongly suspect *μήτε κώπης μήτε λόγχης μηδὲ φλύκταναν λαβών*. 'Getting not even a gall from either oar or spear.'

We might compare Propertius v. 3, 24

num gravis imbelles atterit hasta manus?

E. S. THOMPSON.

ON A MISUNDERSTOOD PASSAGE IN THE *TRINUMMUS* OF PLAUTUS, vs. 642—4.

Itan tandem hanc maiores famam tradiderunt tibi tui
Vt virtute eorum anteparta per flagitium perderes
Atque honori posterorum tuorum ut vindex fieres?

THE facts are as follows. Lesbonicus, the prodigal, has squandered his property, with the exception of a suburban estate. His sister is sought in marriage by his friend Lysiteles. Lesbonicus can give her no marriage portion, but insists on selling the

farm and thus providing a dowry for his sister. When remonstrated with by Lysiteles and his father, who say that they care nothing about a dowry, Lesbonicus becomes indignant. He is suddenly very jealous of the family honour, and cannot allow his sister to be given in marriage without a suitable marriage portion. He cannot be kept from paying some attention to popular feeling (*rumor*). At this Lysiteles bursts out upon him with the indignant words vs. 642—4. These words have been quite uniformly rendered as follows: 'Is it on such terms, pray, that your ancestors transmitted this reputation to you,—that by your infamous life you should destroy what had been secured by their worthy deeds, and that you should become the hangman for the honour of your posterity?'

The word *vindex* has troubled all the editors. It is found in all the MSS. except that, in B, the letter *i* is damaged and uncertain. Lambinus and Douza read *ut vibex*, though on the evidence of Camerarius *vindex* stood in the MSS. Other readings proposed are *index*, *inlex*, *vendax*, *obex*. Taubmann and Gronovius, who retain *vindex*, explain the passage substantially as follows: *ut honorem contaminares, et violares, et tolleres*. Turnebus, in his commentary on Varro's use of *vindicta*, quotes this passage from the *Trinummus*, and interprets *vindex* as one who frees, releases, as a slave was set free by the *vindicta*. He explains the passage thus: *ut honorem manumitteres, et liberares, ne tuis tamquam addictus serviret et in familia esset*. Scaliger says: *vindicare nihil aliud est quam ἐξελείν, ἀφελείν*. Gronovius interprets *vindicare* as = *auferre*: *vindicta* = *ablatio*: and *vindex* = *qui aufert*. Petrus Valla interprets *vindex* as *ultor*. This seems to give a hint as to the true meaning of the passage, though neither Valla nor any of the early commentators followed it out. Of the modern editors, all, so far as I have observed, follow the old editions, and interpret *vindex* as meaning *executioner* or *hangman*. Harrington in his edition (1870) renders: 'that you might become the hangman for the honor of your posterity, i.e. might destroy it.' Wagner says: 'Lesbonicus is represented as the murderer of the fair name of his progeny: *posterorum honorem ut ita dicam iugulavit*. The expression is however quite isolated.' Freeman and Sloman (1890) say: '*vindex* is a difficult word in this connexion': and after suggesting different possible meanings, they finally conclude

that it means *executioner, destroyer*. Brix, in his third edition, is of the same opinion. He compares Sallust *Cat.* 55 *vindices rerum capitalium...laqueo gulam fregere*. 'So meint hier Lesbonicus "haben dich etwa Vorfahren zum Henker (Nachrichter) der Ehre deiner Nachkommen gesetzt"?' He also quotes G. Valla: *ut ulciscaris ac iugules honorem qui venturus erat ad posteros*. Ritschl, *Opuscula*, vol. ii. p. 526, thinks the passage a very troublesome one. He has the feeling that the traditional text (*vindex*) is correct, and would rather let it remain, though he does not understand it, than substitute an intelligible *tu obex*. The nearest approach which he can make to an intelligible and satisfactory idea, is that suggested by the passage from Sallust above quoted, which refers to the 'Tresviri rerum capitalium in ihrer Eigenschaft also Vollstrecker des Todesurtheils.' 'Der Plautinische Ausdruck ist also ganz deutlich und schön wie unser "der Henker seiner eigenen Ehre."'

It has long seemed to me that this is not at all the meaning of the passage, and that the various editors have gone far out of their way to find a difficulty where none exists. Not only the natural meaning of the word *vindex*, but also the general spirit and context of the passage, suggest a very different and a much happier rendering. The word *vindex* means not only an *avenger*, a *punisher*, but also, one who maintains, defends, protects, etc. Vanicek, *Etymolog. Wörterbuch*, interprets it as *Bürge, Beschützer, Befreier, Rächer*. In the Laws of the XII. Tables we read: '*Adsiduo vindex adsiduos esto, proletario iam civi quis volet vindex esto* (see Gell. xvi. 10, 5), i.e. 'the *vindex* of a property holder must be a property holder; but whoever chooses can be the *vindex* for a man without property.' The *vindex* here is one who agrees to go before the magistrate as the representative of the defendant, and so takes upon himself the action in place of the latter (see Allen's *Early Latin*). In a suit for manumission, the *vindex* (Hadley's *Roman Law*, p. 112) was a Roman citizen who maintained the cause of the slave, asserting that he was of right a free man. This is in harmony with the meaning of *vindicta*, i.e. the rod which was used in the formal emancipation of a slave,—in maintaining and defending his right to freedom. Festus' explanation is: *vindex ab eo, quod vindicat, quo minus is, qui prensus est, ab aliquo teneatur*. The use of the word in the classical authors abundantly indorses this meaning. Livy, xxi. 52, 6, says

of the Gauls, that when their territory was plundered by Hannibal, though they had for a time maintained a neutral attitude, yet compelled by the Punic outrages, *ad vindices futuros declinant*, i.e. to those who would be their avengers or champions. Cicero, *Leg. iii.* 17, 393, calls the *tabella* the *vindex libertatis*, i.e. the champion or defender of liberty. There is no question then but that this meaning is abundantly indorsed; and indeed it is so natural that one can only be surprised that it has not suggested itself to previous editors. This meaning has been suggested in connexion with this passage from the *Trinummus* in some Latin Lexicons; e.g. in White and Riddle's, 1862, and in Harper's, which agree in rendering it 'preserver.' The context of the passage suggests with equal plainness and force this same meaning. Lesbonicus has been a prodigal son. He has squandered the property in his father's absence. By his vicious life he has done all within his power to ruin the good name of the family. But suddenly, in connexion with the proposed marriage of his sister, he assumes a highly virtuous air. He is jealous of the family honour. This inconsistency—this sudden change in his spirit and conduct—is what rouses the wrath of Lysiteles. 'You have been doing all that was possible to ruin the family honour: now do you hope by a sudden spasm of virtue to make good all your past delinquency?' There is a double contrast in the verses 642—649. vs. 642—3 are contrasted with 644, and again, in the same spirit, vs. 645—8 are contrasted with 649. No one can read the passage without observing this. And the contrast in both cases is between the former scandalous life of Lesbonicus and his present assumption of great regard

for the family honour. The meaning of the passage then is in substance as follows: 'Is it on these terms, pray, that your ancestors transmitted this good name to you, viz. that by your vicious life you should do all in your power to destroy their previously acquired stores of virtue, and then should suddenly set up as the champion and defender of the honour of posterity?'

The following lines carry out the same contrast. 'Your ancestors made the path of honour easy for you; you have done your best to make it hard. Now by this sudden pretence of virtue do you think to obliterate all the past?' Such a rendering is much more striking than any of the others and has everything in its favour. The notes of Brix, Wagner, *et al.*, do not recognize any such contrast, though it is evident not only in the conduct of Lesbonicus, but in the language of his friend. They make vs. 644 simply enlarge upon the thought of 643. It is Lesbonicus' pretended regard for *rumor* that rouses the wrath of Lysiteles; and yet, as generally rendered, the verses make no reference to this idea. The use of *atque* in a somewhat adversative sense is well known. It is found in the sense of *et tamen* in *Trin.* 336, *nusquam per virtutem rem confregit, atque eget*: also in *Pseud.* 106, 278, 309 (Morris' *Pseudolus*), *Ter. Ad. atque ex me hic natus non est*. See Draeger's *Hist. Synt. d. Lat. Spr.* ii. § 315, 9. I conclude then that the reference to *rumor*, the force of *ita* which is emphatic, the use of *atque*, the meaning of *vindex*, and the whole context and spirit of the passage, are plainly in favour of the rendering which I suggest.

A. G. HOPKINS.

HAMILTON COLLEGE,
Clinton, N. Y.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THUCYDIDES VI. 11, 2, 3.

Σικελιώται δ' ἂν μοι δοκοῦσιν, ὥς γε νῦν ἔχουσι, καὶ ἔτι ἂν ἦσαν δεινοὶ ἡμῖν γενέσθαι, εἰ ἀρξείαν αὐτῶν Συρακόσιοι, ὅπερ οἱ Ἑγεσταῖοι μάλιστα ἐκφοβοῦσι. νῦν μὲν γὰρ κἂν ἔλθοιεν ἴσως Λακεδαιμονίων ἕκαστοι χάριτι, ἐκείνως δ' οὐκ εἰκὸς ἀρχὴν ἐπὶ ἀρχὴν στρατεύσασθαι· ᾧ γὰρ ἂν τρόπῳ τὴν ἡμετέραν μετὰ Πελοποννησίων ἀφέλωνται, εἰκὸς ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν σφετέραν διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ καθαιρεθῆναι.

Nicias is seeking for arguments to dissuade his hearers from interfering with

Sicily, and in the above passage he indulges in a highly rhetorical enthymeme to back up what he has just said. ἀνόητον ἐπὶ τοιούτους ἰέναι, he has exclaimed. But the words that follow the exclamation, those that are here quoted, have been strangely misinterpreted. When writing a note upon the passage, I had no doubt that ὥς γε νῦν ἔχουσι means 'as they at present are,' i.e. 'undisturbed by an Athenian invasion,' which might, as Nicias says, lead the Sice-

liots to join Sparta in an attack on Athens. But, on reading the commentators, I was much surprised to find that ὡς γε νῦν ἔχουσι means either (1) 'considering the actual state of Sicily' (Arnold, Bloomfield, Stahl, Fr. Müller, Sitzler and others) or (2) 'as they now are,' *sc.* they are not formidable (Schol., Classen, Herbst, Jowett, etc.). Herbst calls this ellipse of οὐ δεινοὶ εἶναι Thucydidean and beautiful; and he finds some mysterious support for it in the first ἄν. This ἄν is really in itself fatal to his notion; for the sense required is not 'they would not be,' but 'they are not' formidable. Nor can it be said that νῦν μὲν γὰρ κἂν ἔλθουεν ἕκαστοι is in any sense a reason for saying οὐκ ἄν δεινοὶ εἴεν. This interpretation of Herbst's rests on the groundless assumption that ὡς γε νῦν ἔχουσι must form an antithesis to εἰ ἄρξαιεν αὐτῶν Συρακόσιοι. Is it not clear that the antithesis is left unexpressed, and, as constantly with the comparative, is implied only by an ellipse of the most familiar sort in ἦσσαν ἄν δεινοὶ *sc.* ἡ νῦν εἴοι; (This much indeed is pointed out by Mr. Dougan in his note.)

Stahl understands ὡς...ἔχουσι 'while they are independent'; but, as Herbst says, this reduces the sentence to chaos. Nor does Arnold's 'looking at the actual state of S.' yield any tolerable sense; because it is impossible to talk of regarding the *present*

state of a country without implying a contrast between either the present and the past, or the present and the future. Now if Nicias meant the present as contrasted with the past state of Sicily, he could not draw from such a contrast any support for the statement that a Syracusan empire will be favourable to Athens. On the other hand, were he in ὡς...ἔχουσι contrasting the present with the future Sicily, ὡς γε νῦν ἔχουσι would become the antithesis to καὶ ἔτι ἄν ἦσσαν δεινοὶ γενέσθαι, and would have to be expressed as such. The only other antithesis between present and future is that which I have indicated, *i.e.* 'considering their state now, as contrasted with what their state would be if we invaded Sicily,' and so produced an entire alteration of the conditions. But Arnold, as his note shows, did not mean this.

I have quoted the sentence ὅ γὰρ ἄν πρότερον...καταπεθῆναι because it lends strong support to my interpretation. It shows that Nicias is arguing solely on the assumption that Athens allows events to take their course, and refrains from giving offence to the Siceliot. If she interferes, then, in case of failure, Syracuse may still gain an empire. But such interference and failure would under any circumstances lead to a union between the Siceliot and Sparta.

E. C. MARCHANT.

TACITUS, AGRICOLA 24.

Quinto expeditionum anno nave prima transgressus ignotas ad id tempus gentis crebris simul ac prosperis proeliis domuit; eamque partem Britanniae quae Hiberniam aspicit copiis instruxit.

In this passage the words *nave prima* have been a cause of concern to many scholars. Kritz takes them to be the same as *prima navigatione*, 'when navigation began after the winter,' but this is a counsel of despair and emendations have been freely suggested and accepted—*vere primo* by Becker and Peter, *nave primum* by Boot, *navi in proxima* by Rigler and Wex, *in Clotae proxima* by Nipperdey, *maritima* by Urlichs, *Sabrinam* by Madvig (*Adv.* i. 347), *Britanniam* or *aestate prima* by Peerlkamp. Not one of these emendations is satisfactory: most of them had better have never been printed. It may be possible to retain the manuscript reading

and take *prima* as a neuter plural accusative: Agricola crossed by sea the first part of his journey. The order *nave prima* suggests that the two words are not to be taken as noun and adjective in agreement.

It is impossible to decide what tribes were conquered in the expedition here mentioned. If we take Tacitus literally, we may infer from ch. 23 that they lived north of the Clyde and Forth, and the sentence immediately following *domuit*—*eamque partem Britanniae quae Hiberniam aspicit copiis instruxit*—has generally been held to imply that Agricola now crossed the Clyde into southern Argyleshire. But the geographical statements of Tacitus are seldom precise, the words *copiis instruxit* cannot refer to Argyleshire, and the connecting *que* does not in the least prove that the two sentences refer to the same thing. The *ignotae gentes* are, therefore,

not to be identified, while the part of Britain which looks towards Ireland, and was now garrisoned, may be north Wales or Cumberland. The Hardknot fragment GRIC LA CoII (C. vii. 334) may possibly refer to Iulius Agricola: the record of coins from this fort, a quinarius of Domitian (A.D.

91), a Trajan, and two Republican issues, would suit such an idea. There are possible though not certain traces of Agricola at Carlisle also. But, in the present state of our knowledge, one can only indicate possibilities.

F. HAVERFIELD.

A CLIMATE IN DISGUISE.

IN the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* viii. Mr. Ryssel publishes, in the original Syriac, the astronomical letters of Bishop George († 724). On page 49, where the bishop is enumerating the climates or latitudes of the world, we find that the third, counted from the south of the *οίκουμένη*, was called '*diatisiktakhoras*?' (the query is Ryssel's). In a note the editor tries to identify this unheard-of name with the city of Thisika in Zeugitana, although there is no reason why the latitude should have taken its name from a spot prominent

neither in commerce nor in learning. Ryssel himself adds that Martianus Capella puts Alexandria in the corresponding place, but he is far from using this hint. For of course *diatisiktakhoras* is nothing but the Greek *διὰ τῆς κάτω χώρας*. And this is an expression frequently used by Ptolemy for Alexandria, the capital of lower Egypt, through which his third degree had been laid.

New York.

E. RIESS.

NOTE ON THE HOMERIC DIAERESIS.

MR. MONRO in his *Homer Iliad*, Books i.—xii. page lxxvi. § 50, lays it down as one of 'the two main rules of the Homeric Hexameter' that '*the third foot must not end with a word*, that is to say, there must be no break which would allow the line to fall into two equal parts.'

The same writer in his *Homeric Grammar* § 367, after defining diaeresis as 'the coincidence of the division between words with the division into feet,' adds absolutely that 'there must be no diaeresis after the third foot.'

Yet on turning to the first book that comes to hand, N, and passing over a great number of instances that violate Mr. Monro's canon, but which might perhaps be explained away by the presence of proclitics as:—

L. 1. Ζεὺς δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν Τρώας τε καὶ | Ἑκτορα
νηυσὶ πέλασσαν
or of enclitics:—

L. 16. Τρωσὶν δαμναμένους, Διὶ | δὲ κρα-
τερῶς ἐνέμεσσα
or of elisions:—

L. 28. πάντοθεν ἐκ κευθμῶν, οὐδ' | ἠγνοίη-
σαν ἄνακτα

I still find the forbidden diaeresis once at least, on an average, every 50 lines. The instances I have noticed are—

L. 21. Αἰγὰς ἔνθα τέ οἱ κλυτὰ | δώματα
βένθεσι λίμνης.

There is as clear a pause after κλυτά, as after 'ivied' in this line of Tennyson's *Locksley Hall*:—

'Many a night from yonder ivied | case-
ment, ere I went to rest,'

The other cases are 78, 157, 174, 191, 237, 263, 471, 474, 592, 688, 703, 725, 740, 803, 817 (Paley's ed.).

In the following instance (γ. 34):—

οἱ δ' ὥς οὖν ξείνους ἴδον, | ἀθρόοι ἦλθον
ἅπαντες—

the diaeresis not only halves the line but even coincides with the principal verse pause.

Mr. Monro's statements therefore seem to require some modification.

CHARLES COUPE, S. J.

STONYHURST COLLEGE.
Jan. 2, 1895.

MATT. XI. 19.

WESTCOTT and HORT have adopted the reading *ἔργων* for *τέκνων*, and their judgment has been followed by our Revisers. Is it not possible, however, that *ἔργων* is really a gloss upon *τέκνων*? that the *τέκνα σοφίας* may be, not wise people, but the *results* of wisdom, what wisdom *produces*. The expression would seem a strange one, and, indeed, it seems never to have been so

interpreted. All the more likely that an easier word should be substituted. Cf. ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιγνώσεσθε αὐτοὺς. Aesch. Agam. 728 (Herm.):

τὸ δυσσεβὲς γὰρ ἔργον
μετὰ μὲν πλείονα τίκτει
σφετέρῃ δ' εἰκότα γέννα.

FREDERIC T. COLBY.

WADDELL'S EDITION OF THE PARMENIDES.

The Parmenides of Plato, after the paging of the Clarke Manuscript, with Introductions, Facsimiles and Notes. WILLIAM WARDLAW WADDELL, M.A., Glasgow and Oxford. Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons. 1894. 31s. 6d. net.

Those who know how few really good editions of the Platonic dialogues there are will warmly welcome this addition to their number. To the fastidious lover of beautiful books it will be commended by its wide margins, the texture of the paper and the clearness of the print, which recalls the old glories of the Foulis press. The student of palaeography will be attracted by the fidelity with which not merely the spelling and division of sentences, but even the marking of erasures, the tall letters, the exact form of page and line in the Codex Clarkianus are here presented to the eye. Perhaps indeed the taste of so much will only whet his appetite for more. Now that photography has reproduced the Laurentian Sophocles and Paris 8 of Demosthenes, is it too much to expect that some day we shall have a facsimile of the Bodleian Plato? The editor has given a faithful and exact copy of the thirty-nine pages which his dialogue occupies in that manuscript, but is content with a facsimile of the first.

The critical portion of the introduction—some fifty quarto pages—dwells in commendable detail on the characteristics of the three chief MSS. of Plato, viz. the Clarkianus in the Bodleian Library, Paris A, and the Venice manuscript (Append. Class 4, no. 1 in the Library of St. Mark) which in 1877 was discovered by Schanz to be the archetype, for the first six tetralogies

at any rate, of all codices not deriving from the Clarkianus. Each of these three is fully described, nor will any one grudge the three or four pages devoted to retelling, in Clarke's own words, the story of the adventurous voyage by which this 'fairest specimen of Grecian caligraphy' was auspiciously acquired from the Superior of a monastery actually unable to read. Copious collections of variants are also presented with a view to determining the question whether Cobet is right in his contention that all MSS. of the first family are really derived from the Clarkianus, so that any independent readings they give must be due to conjecture alone. Besides a comparison of selected readings from the *Parmenides* of Δ II and Codex Crusianus, the editor has performed the useful office of collating Codex Crusianus throughout the dialogue: its readings, not hitherto published, are given on pp. 41—74 in a column between a most minute record of the readings of the Clarkianus and Venice t (or T, as Schanz calls it). The evidence of the *Parmenides* does not tend to establish decisively any view of the relations between Δ II and Tub. (i.e. Codex Crusianus) on the one hand and the Clarkianus on the other.

'From this synopsis it seems clear (1) that Π cannot be derived from Tub. since it contains at intervals ten passages at least of which there is in Tub. no trace; (2) that Tub. is not likely to have come from Π since it gives three passages which are not found in Π. It is conceded that Π' the Clarke MS. 'is much older than either; and accordingly two conclusions are open to us as alternatives, (α) either Tub. and Π both come from Π, or an early copy or copies of it now lost; or (β) all three descend from one original now lost.' Introd. p. xc.

Highly amusing is the dispassionate

account of Usener's recent theory as to the transmission of the Platonic text, suggested by the extraordinary variants of the Flinders-Petrie papyri: a theory, Mr. Waddell remarks, 'eminently fascinating, but dependent a good deal upon assumptions in excess of his data. It may be well,' he continues, 'to give on the one hand what seem to be the data, and to add on the other the assumptions.' Accordingly we begin with the first of the data: that 'Apellicon's private library, which comprised those of Aristotle and Theophrastus, was taken to Rome by Sulla, and submitted to the editorial scrutiny of the celebrated scholar Tyrannion' with its parallel assumption that 'this library included careful if not original copies of Plato's works.' And so on, until we come to 3, where the datum that 'Atticus was a great scholarly publisher like Aldus' has associated with it the assumption that 'the ἀντίγραφα Ἀττικιανὰ are his editions: Tyrannion was his editor. Our MSS. of Plato descend through this channel from the library of Aristotle.' Well may Mr. Waddell add 'How much one desires to accept all this as historical fact! Yet even the initial assumption of an "Attic" origin for all our MSS. rests on no broader foundation than a single ὑφ' for ἐξ.'

When we pass from his introduction to the text we are not surprised that such loving and painstaking study of the authorities should have fostered in the editor a mental attitude of cautious conservatism. Thus we find that he adheres to the Bodleian in some passages where even C. F. Hermann had abandoned it. For instance, 149 B τῶν ἄλλων ἄ is defended against τῶν ἄψων t with an ingenuity worthy of a better cause (p. 144): so 150 B, οὐ τε γε is read, not οὐ τι γε, as in t, much less is C. F. Hermann's correction οὐδέ γε, or Heindorf's οὐ τοι γε (neque tamen) admitted. If we ask why οὐτε stands alone, we are told that the original design of the sentence was οὐτε ἐν ὄλῳ, οὐτε γε ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ μέρει: that as it went on this design was changed by the interposition of ἀλλ' εἴπερ ἐν μέρει; at length the sentence, then, assumed its present form ἐν μὲν ὄλῳ ἄρα τῷ ἐνὶ οὐκ ἂν εἶη συμκρότης—ἀλλ' εἴπερ ἐν μέρει—οὐ τι γε ἐν παντὶ αὐτῷ μέρει. Another case is 132 c, where fidelity to the minutiae of the Bodleian presents a famous passage in the argument in an original and suggestive form, viz. οὐκ ἀνάγκη ἢ τὰλλα φῆς τῶν εἰδῶν μετέχειν ἢ δοκεῖ σοι... πάντα νοεῖν ἢ νοήματα ὄντα ἀνόητα εἶναι; Previous editors had retained the nomina-

tive ἀνάγκη of ἄ but had altered ἦ to εἰ and δοκεῖ to δοκεῖν. Our editor, with an eye to economy, finds that the single change to the dative ἀνάγκῃ enables him to dispense with the other two, while for the construction he can adduce ample authority in *Phaedr.* 264 B, σὺ δ' ἔχεις τινὰ ἀνάγκην λογογραφικὴν, ἢ... ἔθηκεν, and *Phaedo* 76 E. On the other hand it must be confessed that, whether the scribe wrote from dictation or not, he appears to have confused -ει with -η or -η very frequently: our editor has changed -η or -η of ἄ into -ει at 129 D, 135 B, 137 D (ἐχῆ ἄ bis), 150 B, 159 C, 165 C; while he has made the corresponding change from -ει of ἄ to -η or -η at 131 C, 132 B, 146 B, 164 C. Nor are the other errors consequent upon itacism unrepresented in ἄ, as indeed is notorious. Another novel feature is that at 131 A (as at 164 E), and so also at 131 B, 138 A and elsewhere ἐν εἶναι, ἐν ἔσται, ἐν εἶη are retained where modern editors have changed to ἐνεῖναι, ἐνέσται, ἐνεῖη. Again at 137 E, where μετέχει is read without ἄν, it is instructive to contrast the words of the two editors: 'ἄν, cuius ut omnino vel optimi codices leges ignorarunt,' says Hermann: Mr. Waddell, 'ἄν is a delicate subject. If it be imperative here we might urge that it may be understood from οὐτ' ἄν ἀρχὴν above: or alternatively that μετέχει might be μετέχει... again as ἄν is often redundantly repeated it may sometimes be repressed.' We are disposed to regard with favour the readings of ἄ defended at 163 E (τοῦτον μετέχειν), 165 B (συμκρός not συμκροῖς), 165 C (τε not γε), 166 A (ὑπὸ not ἐπὶ). Most interesting is it to find the emendations of a Heindorf (143 B, οὐσία, 150 C, αὐτῷ) and still earlier a Stephanus (152 A, κοινωνία) confirmed by ἄ. With a courage that does him honour Mr. Waddell has printed Παρμενίδης throughout his text (as also πραγματιώδη, πραγματιάν which it is not so easy to justify): but in his good and careful note p. 75 f. we fail to find any sufficient clue to the variation. He might have adduced Παρμενίδας from the great Larisæan inscription of date B.C. 214 (in Collitz, vol. i. n. 345). It is unquestionably the right form, and Prof. Weir Smyth pronounces definitely that 'Παρμενίδης owes its -ίδης to the analogy of Παρρονίδης,' *Ionian Dialect* § 572.

In accordance with his critical principles the editor is sparing of introducing conjectures into the text. Many suggestions of his however, some even bold to rashness, are duly recorded in the notes. We may

single out as the most important: 127 B, ἐνεγέκοντα for ἐξέκοντα, 127 C, <οὐ>πολλούς, 128 B, [δὲ] καὶ, 130 C αὐ τῶν <τῇδε> ὧν for αὐτῶν ἢ ὧν A. This slightly alters the look of the sentence: 'a palaeographer will know that a contracted τῇδε in majuscules might be very like 'H,' remarks the editor, and accordingly inserts τῇδε in his text. At 131 B the punctuation εἰ γε, φάναι, οἶον εἴη ἡμέρα (ἢ...ἐστίν) εἰ οὕτω is new. At 141 D 'the tempting suggestion,' to change τὸ γέγονε into τὸ ἐγγένοι and ποτὶ γέγονεν into ποτ' ἐγγένοι, is declined. At 149 D [ἀρα] or (by transposition) οὐκ ἀρα are diffidently proposed. At 165 A it is pointed out that δόξεν ελθεῖν cannot stand (the context is πρὶν εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ δόξεν ελθεῖν): the suggestion δόξαν seems perfectly satisfactory. At 165 B, for ἄλλα μεσαίτερα τὰ τοῦ μέσου A the text reads ἄλλα μεσαίτερα τοῦτον μέσα: this not only accounts for the τὰ of A which t and the editors are content to omit, but also yields a better parallel to the two phrases immediately preceding. Nor can there be any question that 165 C δέξιν γνόντι is decidedly nearer to A δέξινοντι and therefore preferable to δέξιν νοούντι of t. There are however one or two passages where literal adherence to A would seem to have landed the editor in difficulties. Thus 133 B he remarks: 'ἦ is given from a strong desire to follow A wherever it yields a meaning. But the constr. is unusual, and t reads εἰ ἐν which also corresponds with ἐάν τις above.' If we must be precise, A actually reads ἦ, it seems (p. 47): by following it in this case we make Parmenides say οὐδέπω ἄπται αὐτῆς ὅση ἐστὶν ἡ ἀπορία, ἦ ἐν εἶδος ἕκαστον τῶν ὄντων αἰεὶ τι ἀφορίζομενος θήσεις, and before accepting this we should like some examples justifying the expression ἀπορία τιθεῖναι or ἀφορίζεσθαι. The note on 141 C, ἀνάγκη γὰρ οὖν, runs 'οὖν so t, A has ἄν: the two words, however written, might easily be interchanged.' There seems to be some inaccuracy here: at all events the critical notes (p. 54, line 10) give γάρ as the variant of t for γὰρ οὖν. To omit the ἄν altogether seems best: ἄν can be accounted for by ἄλλα which follows. At 143 B, 158 B A gives εἰ, δῶμεν which editors have changed into ἰδῶμεν. Our editor retains it on the authority of a passage in the *Frogs*. But are the contexts at all similar? 'It is best to keep quiet that we may know for certain,' say the Chorus, ὥς ἂν εἰδῶμεν σαφῶς. In the dialogue, Parmenides has inquired: 'Will this same thing be one only or many?' and having received the reply

'One, I think' we are required to imagine him continuing, 'Let us know.' Incredible: he must have said 'let us see.' At 154 E our editor admits that very likely t gives the true reading, viz. γέγονε πρεσβύτερον τὸ δὲ νεώτερον γίγνεται δ' οὖν. He prints as his text however 'an attempt to adjust A so as to yield a satisfactory meaning.' The attempt is worth examining. A having τὸδε not τὸ δὲ, we alter οὖν into αὖ with the result ἄλλ' ἐστὶ καὶ γέγονε πρεσβύτερον τὸδε, νεώτερον δ' αὖ. Had precisely this been found in any MS. (as it is not) who, we ask, εἰ μὴ θέσιν διαφυλάττων, would prefer it to the intelligible alternative presented by t? Similarly 155 A our editor alters αὐτοῖν to αὐτῶ, simply to avoid repeating τὸ ἐναντίον with t. The note on 156 D seems to us lamentable. A reads οὔτε γὰρ ἐστὸς ὧν οὔτε κινούμενον μεταβάλλει, 't seems to give ἄν for ὧν, and the accepted course is to adopt this and read μεταβάλλου.' So we should think, -ει and -οι having been pronounced alike and confused by the scribes of over a thousand years. But no: 'we hesitate to make a double change in A'—why?—'and so read οὖν, not with any great conviction, the position being strained and the word occurring four times rapidly.' This is perfectly gratuitous for, as is excellently pointed out, the text of A construes as it stands if we take ἐστὸς and κινούμενον as adjectives: that they sometimes were adjectives to Plato is clear enough apart from 159 A (quoted in the note) if we compare e.g. *Soph.* 249 A. Again, the note on 157 B, where τί δαί is read in the text, suggests that τί δὲ, as in t, was the original reading of A. Nor is μετέχει αὐ πῃ, 157 C, a plausible explanation of μετέχει πῃ in t seems right enough. But we have given instances enough of the editor's affection for the minutest variations of the Bodleian, and must in justice allow that this scholarly instinct has not with him degenerated into a blind idolatry. It has perhaps confirmed him in a cautious timidity, which is after all a natural attitude towards a manuscript authority so excellent as A, even if here and there pushed too far (e.g. 163 A, ἔχει ὡς ἔχει, B ταῦτα). His sobriety is the more noteworthy, because just now it is conservative criticism that is aggressive and almost ready, it would seem, to retort upon Cobet 'quasi vero semel usquam in praestantissimo codice absurdae lectiones compareant aut manum ipsam [Platonis] conjectura revocaverit!' Yet it is largely a question of degree: on only three of its thirty-nine pages (p. 1, p. 2, p. 22) does the

editor's text of the dialogue agree exactly—allowance being made for punctuation, iota subscribed, and other minutiae recorded in the critical notes—with his favourite codex. Sometimes (e.g. on p. 10) the alterations average one to every five lines.

The part of the introduction which deals with the authorship of the *Parmenides* is written in an eminently judicious and impartial manner. It is not so easy as Grote imagined to identify the canon of Thrasyllus offhand with the catalogue of Plato's works in the Alexandrine Library, prepared (as he thought) by Aristophanes. Each dialogue in the canon must present its own credentials, if spurious productions were written to sell, and actually were sold, to the great libraries. And none of the suspected dialogues is in a better position, on grounds external and internal, to defy all attacks than the *Parmenides*. Who was the metaphysical genius capable of writing such a work and yet content to merge his name and fame in Plato's? Discussion on the point might seem superfluous: yet we heartily sympathize with the editor's remarks on Aristotle's alleged silence. After alluding to some general characteristics of the *Metaphysics* he says with perfect truth, 'no dialogue which Plato ever wrote would form a more natural or obvious text for Aristotle's criticisms than the *Parmenides*.' Taking the conceptions handled in the *Metaphysics*, the terms defined or described as liable to misunderstanding, the technical vocabulary, the insistence on the law of contradiction, he next compares the *Parmenides* and adds: 'it is not meant by this line of argument that the *Metaphysics* is a polemic against the *Parmenides* alone, but that the substance of the *Parmenides* is distinctly included with that of the *Republic*, *Phaedo*, and *Philebus*, in Aristotle's mental picture of Plato's views, and forms a prominent feature in his controversial allusions; that but for the existence of the *Parmenides*, the polemic of Aristotle would lose half its point and value.' This line of defence appears to us most valuable and instructive. Later on, pp. x.—xiii., Ueberweg's mistaken inference from *Met.* i. 6, 987b 9, is shown to rest on a misconception of the phrase ἐν κοινῷ ὑπάρχειν and his strange inference from the τῶν ἁνθρώπων is rebutted. The editor might have strengthened his case considerably by claiming the introduction of this argument for the sophist Polyxenus, a pupil of the Megarian or Eristic philosopher Bryso. Alexander mentions this on the

authority of Phantias, a Peripatetic, and the fact is not without its bearings upon the origin of the other objections to the ideal theory so vigorously urged by Parmenides, 130 E *sqq.* It is singular that the editor quotes from the commentary on the *Metaphysics* only a few lines below, without observing the citation from Phantias. We heartily agree that 'it is hard to understand how any one reading *Met.* i. 9 could assume that the agreement called τ.δ. originated with Aristotle.' Its use by Plato in the *Republic* and *Timaeus* is, of course, no proof that it had not an independent origin.

Of all objections to the genuineness of the dialogue there is only one worth answering, viz. Socher's: so gerb geht doch wohl kein Schriftsteller sich selbst zu Leibe! When Socrates has been silenced and the ideal theory refuted, the suggestion that an enemy hath done this loses half its absurdity. There is but one way of meeting this objection, and that is by exhibiting the motives which inspired this remarkable effort of dialectic so clearly and intelligibly that we may see its appropriate place in the Platonic system. Our editor, while abounding in luminous and suggestive remarks, can hardly be said to have satisfied the conditions we have laid down. He gently sets aside the arguments from style (including statistics) and those from dramatic setting, and uses the philosophic content of the dialogue to determine its place in the series. Although hardly any two expositors are quite agreed as to the author's design in Part I. or in Part II., or as to the relation of the one part to the other, there has been a tendency to accept, with more or less reserve, Zeller's view that the difficulties of the first part are met indirectly, not directly, in the second, as at least a starting-point for further discussion. Also of late the *Parmenides* has by many authorities (though not by Zeller) been assigned to the later period of Plato's authorship, later than the *Republic*, earlier than the *Laws*. We are not a little surprised to find that our editor adduces a long string of reasons (pp. xxviii.—xxxiii.) why the work should be classed with Plato's earliest speculations. Here we must distinguish. It is not that he supposes, with Schleiermacher and Grote, that the second part of the dialogue is nothing else than a preliminary exercise, a lesson in dialectic. On the contrary, while he does not wholly exclude that aim, he supposes (p. 111) that the antinomies not only develop what is latent in the doctrine

of historical Eleaticism, but also advance Plato's own conception of the ideal problem, by disclosing within the ideal world a complexity analogous to that in the sensible world. At the same time he urges considerations tending to place the *Phaedo*, parts of the *Republic*, the *Phaedrus*, the *Symposium*, in short almost every dialogue dealing with ideas after the *Parmenides*, as if Plato's authorship began with a polemic which he leaves (apparently) unanswered. In this way the dialogue is said to mark a breach in the continuity of Plato's views, a reconstruction of his theory: here he is held to part company with an early and immature conception in favour of those more comprehensive and connected doctrines habitually associated with his name. Such a conclusion from a patient and admiring student deserves, no doubt, careful consideration, but so far from clearing up the old difficulties it seems to add new ones; for either the editor must show that in his subsequent expositions of the ideal theory Plato guards against the objections of *Parmenides*, or if this is notoriously not the case, he has to explain why Plato embarked on an enterprise foredoomed to failure by developing a theory already subjected to such damaging criticism. It is no adequate explanation to tell us, in the spirit and almost in the words of Grote, that a thinker so gifted could not 'reach middle life without being forcibly impressed by the conviction that in the last resort metaphysical questions must be dropped with a sigh, rather than argumentatively set at rest': that Plato 'when impressed by a sense of metaphysical failure, gives this feeling from time to time ample but also playful expression.' So Grote maintained that the two currents of Platonic speculation, the affirmative and the negative, were distinct and independent. It may indeed be well worth while to consider anew the influence which the form of dialogue exerted on Plato, both as author and as philosopher: whether (p. xv.) at times dialogue ran away with him, or his feeling for and delight in literary expression took control of the argument. But all this may easily be exaggerated, and the statement that 'if, on the other hand, conviction is strong within him it asserts itself by rising above conscious defects of argument in great declamatory bursts' would be quite misleading unless it be checked by a reference, say, to *Phaedo* 89 D *sqq.*—a passage which could only have been written by one who never lost his faith in arguments, however

often he had been deceived in them. Cf. *Phil.* 16 B.

The commentary, on an elaborate scale and admirably executed, is everywhere lucid, ingenious, and in an eminent degree sympathetic. The slight changes proposed in punctuation (e.g. 126 B, 137 A) or construction (130 D, 137 C), and the limited number of wholly novel interpretations introduced, have always something to commend them. Take for instance the highly important passage 130 D, μή τι ἢ περὶ πάντων ταῦτόν: this is explained to mean 'I sometimes think that as there are no ideas for hair, mud, filth, so there is none for anything,' so that the ἀβυσθος φλυνάρια arises not from the hopeless complication of the theory when extended to the meanest objects, but from the sea of sensible perceptions unregulated by any idea. This view may not be right, but it is entitled to a respectful hearing. The notes are thoroughly exhaustive: the illustrations of grammar, of fact, of argument collected from various sources leave little for any successor to glean. Much use has been made of Damascius, and quotations enough are given amply to justify the testimonial of the eminent Platonist, W. H. Thompson, that Proclus was by nature a weak vessel, but even in him treasure may occasionally be found. Not that Mr. Waddell exalts too highly the value of what he has discovered: in fact he preserves a distinctly independent attitude towards ancients and moderns alike. He is largely indebted to Grote, yet never has censure been more happily conveyed than in the words, 'but in pressing his view with grave persistency, Grote seems rather to manifest a want of tact. Not only does he miss the literary finesse of the composition; he even raises in a gratuitous manner the question "si un Grec peut avoir de l'esprit."' The execution of the work accords well with the scale of the design: the few flaws to be found in it are of the slightest and far from calling for the deprecatory tone of the preface. The missing reference to Simplicius 'in *Physica*' (p. 112) is, in the edition of Diels, p. 52, 21, 'pag. 12' being the Aldine page. Nor do the unfamiliar contractions 'Schol. Rhunk.', 'Sch. Rh.' denote any hitherto inaccessible scholia; they are simply the edition of Ruhnken (Leyden, 1800) which served as the basis of Bekker's collection.

It is impossible within the limits of this notice to do justice to all the characteristics of the notes: suffice to say that, supplemented by such models of perspicuous

exposition as the summaries of the argument on pp. 105, 110, 123, they furnish welcome guidance through the mazes of the discussion. When we come to weigh the net results and inquire how much should be accepted in modification of existing views, the gain is not at once perceived to be quite so certain or striking. Upon the main position, of an early origin for the dialogue, an opinion has been expressed above. That such a scathing criticism of the ideas preceded the constructive dialogues, or most of them;—this does not seem to be the key which exactly fits the *Parmenides*. In principle it is hardly more justifiable than the assumption of Schaarschmidt, who attributes the work to a sceptical pupil of the Academy, familiar with the objections of Aristotle. If the *Parmenides* stood alone, to shift it to one or other extremity of the series might perhaps serve. But how can its criticisms be isolated from those of the Eleatic stranger, or the half dubious proof advanced by Timaeus (51 B *sqq.*)? More plausible, if not altogether convincing, are the arguments with which the editor supports his view that in the second part the One is not an idea. Not only does he discriminate, as others have done, the various meanings of the ambiguous term One: but he points out that (1) the discussion commences just after the complete severance made between the ideas and the sphere of

'our' science: (2) that the historical Parmenides could not be said to have reached the region of the immaterial: (3) that in the course of the discussion itself One partakes of various ideas (such as Smallness), grows older and younger, and is the subject of opinion and perception (155 D). What then are we to make of this One, as the second part progresses? The editor answers that it is metaphysically an extended atom, its vital functions being three: it is (1) in time; (2) in space; (3) it has individuality, which however is more logical than physical. 'The beginning of existence to our minds for anything is the acquisition by it of distinctness in some form or other.' Other views are put forward, with similar independence and vigour, on controverted points. We have only space to allude to the clever use made of the myth in the *Phaedo* (p. xlvi.) to illustrate the hypothesis of two worlds, sensible and ideal, exact counterparts one of the other: and, lastly, the nature of the reasoning in the second part, the fallacies and violations of the law of contradiction which it is alleged to exhibit: a much disputed question which is fully discussed in the commentary (pp. 115, 117, 135, 137 *sq.*, cf. pp. lx.—lxiii.) and treated with great moderation and good sense.

R. D. HICKS.

HILGARD'S GRAMMATICI GRAECI, PART IV.

Grammatici Graeci, Pars IV., vol. 2. *Choerobosci Scholia in Canones Verbales et Sophronii Excerpta e Characis recensuit et apparatus criticum indicesque adiecit ALFREDUS HILGARD. Annexa sunt partis quartae prolegomena.* Leipzig, B. G. Teubner. 1894. M. 22.

Habent sua fata libelli. The recent death of Heinrich Keil reminds us of the fact that the *Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum* was completed some time ago, long before this collection of the Greek grammarians was undertaken by Uhlig, Hilgard and their collaborators. The main portion indeed of the present volume, the scholia of George Choeroboscus on the verbal *canones* of Theodosius, has been printed before by Bekker in the *Anecdota Graeca*,—and by Gaisford, 1842.

The present edition may well be called the final one. The wretched paper and the small print of Bekker will no longer task eyes which need extra patience on account of the subject-matter. The splendid volumes of the present collection will I trust serve as a wholesome stimulus towards the *historical study*, if not of the Greek language, at least of Greek grammar, and the substantial services of a number of classical scholars will receive renewed attention. Foremost in the order of time is the name of Lobeck, whose endeavour was to maintain the categories and in a measure the treatment of the Alexandrine and Byzantine school. Next we may mention K. E. A. Schmidt, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Grammatik des Griechischen und des Lateinischen*, Halle, 1859; Egger, *Apolonius Dyscoli*, Paris, 1854; G. F. Schoe-

mann, *Die Lehre von den Redetheilen nach den alten etc.*, Berlin, 1862, and the splendid work of *Steinthal*, which, if I am not mistaken, remains the chief thesaurus in this sphere, *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen u. Römern*, Berlin, 1863. It may as well be stated with the utmost plainness at the outset that the Byzantines, of whom Choeroboscus is a fair type, must be considered, not as marking any stage of development of their own, but simply as the conservators and prolix reproducers of their Alexandrine masters. The ever recurrent plaint of *Krumbacher* in his excellent history of Byzantine literature (that the perverse classic scholars will not duly recognize the real value and services of the Byzantines) will not convert at least the weary student of the immortal *Swineherd* of Constantinople. Hilgard in his *Prolegomena* fixes the generation of Choeroboscus, pp. lxi. sqq. He was διάκονος¹ and οἰκουμηνικός διδάσκαλος (Imperial professor) at Constantinople, cf. Justinian Cod. xi. 18. He was also librarian, χαρτοφύλαξ. He flourished (most probably) in the latter part of the reign of Justinian, say 550 A.D. and Schoell had placed him between 300—400, Prof. Sophocles in the chronological tables prefixed to his Byzantine lexicon put him 817. Before we undertake to describe and appreciate the work of the Byzantine professor, it may be well to recur briefly to the κανόνες ῥηματικοί of Theodosius the Alexandrine, briefly and inadequately reviewed by the present writer in a former volume of the Classical Review. Theodosius (and in this respect he differs little from the τεχνικοί, Apollonius and Herodian) presents Greek verb-inflection in a long succession of purely empirical 'rules,' τύπτω (the μεγὰ ῥήμα) is inflected as the absolute and adequate type indeed of the 'verb on ω,' presenting not only all the forms which λῖω has in our school-tables, but in its 'τυπῶ' future it represents μενῶ and the liquid verbs, in its 'ἐτυπον' it exhibits ἐλαβον, in its 'τέντα' it illustrates the type of ὄλωλα, as 'Perfect Middle.' It was a clotheshorse for the entire wardrobe of verb forms.

The great aim of that 'system' is to find a certain way to construct one form out of another, and this is called κανονίζειν.² To illustrate: (Theodosius ed. Hilgard, p. 44, (1889)) 'τύπτομεν: the last syllable of the

genitive participle τος of the Present and Future being dropped (ἀποβαλλομένης) and με being taken before the ν, the first person plural is made (γίνεται), λέγοντος λέγον λέγομεν, ποιούντος ποιούν ποιοῦμεν, λείποντος λείπον λείπομεν; and the rule (κανὼν) will be seen particularly useful for us in those on -μι, τιθέντος τίθεμεν, διδόντος δίδομεν.' One other example of how to κανονίζειν may be adduced: p. 47, 'τέτυφα: two tenses construct the Perfect (τὸν παρακείμενον); the Imperfect makes the first of the syllables, the Future the ultima, and the penultima (τὴν παραλίγουσαν) and the quantity (ποσότητα) of the syllables. Every Perfect then ends in ᾱ, and has preceding the ending either κ or φ or χ; and this is done in view of (πρὸς) the kinship with the Future; for when the Future is through the σ, the Perfect is through the κ, πείθω πείσω πέπεικα; but when through the ψ, the Perfect (is made) through the φ, λείβω λείψω λέλειφα; but when through the ξ, the Perfect (is made) through the χ, λέγω λέξω λέλεχα; but when the Future (is made) through a liquid (δὴ ἀμεταβόλου) the Perfect is made through it and the κ, κείρω κερῶ κέκαρκα, except the faulty (abnormal) ones, as νενέμηκα and the like. The Perfect has the same penult as the Future, λέξω λέλεχα, except the disyllabic ones of the fifth conjugation (i.e. group, συζυγία) when the penult is on ε; for then it is changed to ᾱ, κερῶ κέκαρκα. The initial syllable, as we said, is made (γίνεται) from the Imperfect (παρατατικός); and when the Imperfect begins with a syllable long by nature or by position (φύσει ἢ θέσει) the Perfect begins with the same, ἡ γόραζον ἡ γόρακα, ἔφθειρον ἔφθαρκα, but when the Imperfect begins with a short syllable (=syllabic augment) the Perfect is reduplicated, ἔλεγον λέλεχα.' But this will suffice to illustrate the κανόνες. They were contrived, not to teach³ Greek to those who knew absolutely no Greek, but from the motives of purism and to preserve literary language as over against the practice of the illiterate populace; to keep that type of speech distinct from that type of Greek which corresponded to the 'vulgar Latin' of the Western Empire.

These κανόνες then were the textbook of Choeroboscus: i.e. he dictated to his pupils (hence σχολία ἀπὸ φωνῆς) his explanations, amplifications, illustrations of the Alexandrines, particularly amplifications. To be just to these dictations we must trust them, not as the literary composition of an author,

¹ Justinian's Novellae show the vast swarm of officials attached e.g. to St. Sophia.

² Steinthal's 'Flexionsschema' is not an adequate version, I believe.

³ Cf. Steinthal, p. 433.

but as the classroom-work of the practical teacher. Thus in the Prolegomena to the verb (p. 1, Hilgard) we learn that illiterate folk said *ἐφάγαμεν ἐφάγατε* and *ἤλθαμεν ἤλθατε, ἰδράμαμεν ἰδράματε, ἐλάβαμεν ἐλάβατε*. We must not, and indeed we will not, wonder that the teacher reiterates the same illustrations, e.g. of what *σολοικίζεν* is, in the Prolegomena of the noun and the verb, cf. p. 104 of iv. 1 with p. 2 of iv. 2, 'ἐγὼ περιπατῶν ὁ τοῖχος ἔπαισεν' ἀντὶ τοῦ 'ἐμοῦ περιπατοῦντος ὁ τοῖχος ἔπαισεν.' In his general Prolegomena he first assigns priority amongst the moods to Indicative, Imperative, Optative, because every complete statement (*τέλειος λόγος*) calls for one of these. Then he enumerates the eight parts of speech (*τὰ μέρη τοῦ λόγου*)—noun (ind. adjective), verb, participle, article, pronoun, preposition (*πρόθεσις*), conjunction (*σύνδεσμος*); why the noun takes precedence before the verb; definition of verb; the tenses; where the modern reader with his habits of Latin terminology will, I believe, often award the palm of significance to the terms of Alexandrine coinage, as *παρατακτικός* for the Imperf. and *παρακείμενος* for the Perfect. The *παρεπόμενα*¹ (hence the *Accidence* of English Grammars) are enumerated. The moods (*ἐγκλίσεις* since Dionysius) in the freer personal analysis of Choeroboscus are often designated as *θέλημα* τῆς ψυχῆς or as *ψυχικὴ προαίρεσις, τουτέστι καθ' ὃ ἐγκλίνεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἢ γοῦν εἰς ὃ ῥέπει ἡ ψυχὴ*, p. 5, and going on he couples the dubitative function (*δυστάσαι*) with the optative function (*τὸ εὐχασθαι*). Further on he enlarges on the sovereign position of the infinitive (*ἡ ἀπαρέμφατος*) among the moods—all the other moods being sometimes resolved into it (*εἰς αὐτὴν ἀναλύονται*). The rank of the moods was a well established topic of grammatical tradition; it is discussed pp. 6–9. Then (p. 9) follows a discussion of the *voices* (*διαθέσεις* from Dionysius on)—*ἐνέργεια, πάθος, μεσότης*, and so forth, all the *παρεπόμενα* being treated in their traditional Dionysian order, ending with the enumeration of the *συζυγίαι*,² of which there are in *ω* six of barytona, and three of perispomena; and in *μ* four. Substantially these categories remained unshaken from Apollonius Dyscolus to Wordsworth's Greek Grammar, whose

fifteenth edition of 1864 lies before me, a full generation after Buttmann had begun to apply linguistic analysis to Greek Grammar, and some time after Veitch's great task of stocktaking of actual forms had been published for the first time.

Choeroboscus is prolix: he takes absolutely nothing for granted, with merciless explicitness category after category is marshalled in his dictations. Theodosius on *τύπτω* has 5½ lines, Ch. has 142; on *τύπτεις* Th. has 8, Ch. has 111; on *τύπτειτον* Th. has 13½, Ch. has 168; on *ἐτυπον* Th. has 14, Ch. has 603. It is not very difficult to make sport of much that we find in Choeroboscus, but we should endeavour to be just in realizing that Choeroboscus was not only an exponent of a grammatical tradition but a creature and a product of the same as well. In a very great number of topics he merely iterates the explanations of his Alexandrine predecessors, particularly the grammarians *par excellence*, Apollonius and Herodianus. Thus, when we read in Choeroboscus a discussion of the problem why there is no 1 p. dual before *τύπτειτον*, we are disinclined to dwell on this profound matter, but when we see that the whole matter is really of Apollonian paternity we are decidedly sobered and inclined to be more respectful. *-μεθον* occurs³ Il. *ψ* 485, Soph. Philoct. 1079, Electr. 950 and in an archaizing passage, Athenaeus iii. p. 98. And from this slender evidence of usage it has been 'canonized' beyond even Buttmann's time. Now then Apollonius with the characteristic craving of the Alexandrines for *ἀναλογία* raised the question: why no active 1 p. dual form (corresponding to the 1 p. dual *τυπτόμεθον*)? and Theodosius too had preserved this '*ζήτημα*' without offering any solution (Theodosius, p. 44, Hilgard). Apollonius had suggested that *τύπτομον* would not do because it lacked the characteristic of the dual, *τ* or *θ*, nor could it abandon the *μ*; and as it could not combine the two characteristic consonants, Greek had to dispense with the form, *τύπτομον* (as Ch. explains, p. 33) or *τύπτοθμον* would not do, because the characteristic consonant of the dual did not have the second place. Herodianus had said (in the generation after Apollonius) that the form would be *τύπτομθον* or *τύπτομτον*, but that this combination was impossible on phonetic grounds.⁴

¹ Cf. Dionysius Thrax, cap. 15.

² It may be well to remember that our 'conjugation' has developed a somewhat different, really a narrower sphere than *συζυγία*, cf. K. E. A. Schmidt, Beiträge, p. 364.

³ Cf. G. Curtius, das verbum der Griechischen Sprache, 2 ed. 1877, I. p. 101. The credit of pointing out the matter belongs to Elmsley on Aristoph. Acharn. 741.

⁴ For which the technical term was *δυσωραζία*.

It is exceedingly instructive to learn better from Choeroboscus the characteristic attitude of the Alexandrines towards analogy and inflexion, particularly as the majority of references are to works of Apollonius and Herodian which are lost. *E.g.* p. 42, Ch. cites Apollonius on favourite vowel combinations; on p. 46, on the augmenting of verbs beginning with the long vowels η and ω : 'just as bodies that have attained their own peculiar size, are not capable of further increase,'—($\delta\nu\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\epsilon\chi\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\alpha\sigma\iota$); or again p. 52: why are other compounds augmented before the entire compound, but prepositional compounds after the preposition? $\iota\nu\alpha\mu\grave{\eta}\epsilon\chi\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\rho\omega\theta\eta\grave{\eta}\grave{\eta}\pi\rho\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma\epsilon\chi\omega\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\delta\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$...

Again, p. 66: why is the 1. perf. of $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\theta\omega$ etc. not $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\alpha$ but $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$? Apollonius 'presents this defence' ($\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu\tau\eta\nu\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$) that the future is 'the cause' or 'responsible' ($\alpha\iota\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$) for the fact that the verbs of the 3rd $\sigma\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ ($\delta\theta\tau$) of barytones do not make their perfect on θ , 'because' ($\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\delta\eta$, l. 35) their future is not made on a double consonant, '—whereas $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega$ makes $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\omega$ and $\pi\acute{\lambda}\epsilon\omega$ $\pi\acute{\lambda}\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omega$, both of which groups ($\sigma\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}$) aspirate their thematic consonant in the perfect: Apollonius puts it this way: *because* thematic $\beta\phi\pi$ and thematic $\gamma\kappa\chi$ combine with σ future into ψ and ξ respectively, *therefore* they aspirate in perf.—*because* thematic $\delta\theta\tau$ do not combine with σ future into a double consonant, *therefore* they do not aspirate their thematic consonant in perfect. I will content myself with citing matter to characterize these efforts, omitting obvious analysis. In this last case Choeroboscus is so bold as to call the second of Apollonius' $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ forced ($\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}$).

On p. 69: $\pi\acute{\lambda}\nu\omega$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\upsilon\kappa\alpha$, but $\phi\acute{\alpha}\iota\lambda\omega$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\phi\alpha\gamma\kappa\alpha$: here, too, Apollonius appears as champion of $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}$. On p. 94 (Attic perfect): $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\iota\phi\omega$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\lambda\iota\phi\alpha$, 'ἐλεύθω' (*sic*) $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\lambda\upsilon\theta\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\omega$ $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\eta\kappa\omicron\alpha$. On $\omicron\iota$ Apoll. says nothing, but Choeroboscus with unflinching courage makes of $\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ $\eta\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha$ and $\epsilon\tau\eta\eta\tau\acute{o}\mu\alpha\kappa\alpha$. On p. 108: why $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\upsilon\kappa\alpha$ but not $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$ or $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omicron\iota\delta\iota\kappa\alpha$? The explanation of Ap. is adopted. On p. 237-38: some unnamed devotees of *analogy* suggested $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\nu\phi\theta\iota$ as perf. imp. corresponding to $\tau\epsilon\tau\nu\phi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, as $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\eta\theta\iota$ accompanied $\tau\upsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$. Ap. taught that the $-\theta\iota$ imperative accompanied only those participles whose genitive had $\nu\tau$: $\tau\upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\eta\theta\iota$, $\delta\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\theta\iota$, $\gamma\omicron\nu\acute{\nu}\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\gamma\acute{\nu}\omega\theta\iota$. On p. 256 Apollonius¹ is

¹ Cf. also Apollonius, Syntax 251, 16.

cited as meeting the objection that an optative of an historical tense (an independent pure optative) was illogical. The references to Herodian are interesting as emphasizing the continuity of grammatical $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma$ as well as the efforts of H. to improve upon Apollonius. On p. 111: in the problem of explaining $\epsilon\iota\omicron\rho\gamma\alpha$, $\epsilon\iota\omicron\lambda\pi\alpha$: H. suggests a thematic $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\omega$. On p. 125 *sq.* the problem is this: $\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha$ and $\eta\gamma\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha$ form the entire aorist on this theme; $\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha$ $\eta\kappa\alpha$ do not. Why not? The 'defence' of Ap. is this: *because* $\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha$ and $\eta\gamma\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha$ have no future in use, therefore they are not prevented from carrying their inflexion to the other moods and to the participle,² but the other verbs have futures in use $\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$ $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega$ $\eta\acute{\sigma}\omega$: *therefore* they are prevented ($\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\tau\alpha\iota$) from extending their inflexion to the other moods and to the participle. But Herodian presents another 'defence' (and it is not very clear to me): $\epsilon\acute{\delta}\omega\kappa\alpha$ $\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha$ $\eta\kappa\alpha$ *ought* to ($\acute{\omega}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\nu$) end on σ ; as it is not the actual case however (p. 126, l. 30), but they end on κ , and κ has no kinship with σ , of course they, as not 'guarding any part of analogy,' are prevented from extending their inflexion to the participle and to the other moods of the aorist. On p. 142, H. explains $\epsilon\delta\rho\alpha\mu\omicron\nu$ from $\delta\rho\alpha\mu\acute{\omega}$. Herodian seems to have taken great pains to hunt up rare verb forms in *actual literature*: p. 143 he cites $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu$ from Alcaeus the comic writer (not the lyricist): $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu$ Herodian explains ($\sigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota=\kappa\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota$) thus: we have $\phi\nu\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$, $\nu\omicron\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\nu\acute{\omicron}\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$, and so $\pi\epsilon\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\eta\mu\alpha$; and $\pi\epsilon\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\omicron\nu$ as $\chi\rho\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\omega}$ $\epsilon\chi\rho\alpha\iota\sigma\mu\omicron\nu$, $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\sigma\theta\omicron\nu$, $\kappa\tau\upsilon\pi\acute{\omega}$ $\epsilon\kappa\tau\upsilon\pi\omicron\nu$. $\Pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\omega$ is impossible for present because the single σ cannot be the characteristic of a barytone present; the verbs of this group ending on $\sigma\sigma$ or ζ . On p. 150 the problem is to explain $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ $\theta\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$, $\acute{\omicron}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$; Ap. suggested a present $\theta\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, etc. Herodian suggested this explanation (p. 151): in the verbs it is the nature of σ and of λ to be doubled $\pi\acute{\lambda}\eta\sigma\sigma\omega$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\lambda\omega$, and those on $\sigma\sigma$ and $\lambda\lambda$ are fond of ($\chi\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$) the barytone accent as $\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omega$ $\pi\acute{\lambda}\eta\sigma\sigma\omega$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\sigma\omega$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\pi\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$ $\sigma\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega$, except unless they are nominal derivatives; for these are perispomena as $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\upsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\omega}$, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\lambda\lambda\alpha$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega}$, $\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\alpha$ $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{\omega}$; and those having *one* σ or *one* λ are 'fond of' the perispomenon accent as $\phi\upsilon\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\nu\omicron\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{\omega}$ $\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}$ $\lambda\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\omega}\phi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}$ $\pi\omega\lambda\acute{\omega}$ $\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}$. Those then that have *one* λ and are not perispomena, I mean $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$

² The general reader will remember that the $\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\chi\eta$ was a separate part of speech.

θέλω ὀφείλω, *divided the inflexion* and as far as the imperfect...are inflected from barytones and after the imperf. in the succeeding tenses make the inflexion as from the perispomena. But this will suffice to show the methods and the problems of grammatical inquiry in the domain of verb-inflexion. I have emphasized the dependence of Choeroboscus on the Alexandrine masters because indeed he rarely seems to go forward alone or to desire to do so. *Steinthal's* summarizing judgment, p. 477, may be here cited: 'Die Theon's sass ihnen tiefer, war ihnen eigener, und so folgten sie ihren Geboten mehr als dem Gebrauche derer (he means the authors of Greek literature) die nichts von Grammatik verstanden, also nicht so gebildet waren wie sie.' The splendid *indices* of Hilgard have doubled the value of this volume and rendered it valuable even for the general Greek student; the citations of dialectal matters are frequent and copious, e.g. to the Attic, Aeolic, Doric, Ionic,¹ with occasional specification of ἀρχαῖοι, or παλαιοί, of νέοι and νεώτεροι or μεταγενέστεροι. The illustrations from the *Iliad* probably outnumber those from all other writers: those from the *Odyssey* are decidedly less frequent. We realize how Homer remained the school author of Greek teachers as Vergil of Roman grammarians, as a glance at Keil's general index will show. Aristophanes is considerably cited and Plutus and Nubes more frequently than the other plays: this too reflects school usage—Sophocles and Euripides somewhat less frequently than Aristophanes. Herodotus not once, Thucydides several times, Xenophon twice, from the *Cyropaedia*, Callimachus much more frequently than these, Theocritus a number of times, chiefly in illustration of Doric dialect.

In conclusion, I beg to call attention to an element of discussion in Choeroboscus which has no direct reference to verb-inflexion at all. I mean the introductory notes of syntactical purport prefixed to his treatment of several of the moods. In the case of the infinitive, 209 *sqq.*, the old question whether the infinitive is a verb or not, and that from certain points of view each may be said; the imperative function of the inf. in Homer is noted, and an

attempt made to explain that usage p. 210, l. 27, viz. it was using the *kind* for the *species* (τὸ γένος ἀντὶ τοῦ εἶδους); further, p. 211, the inf. is discussed in its aspect of a verbal noun:² τὸ περιπατεῖν = ὁ περίπατος; its abstract character, its complementary function with προαιρετικά. In the preliminary remarks on the imperative, p. 231 *sqq.*, the discussion touches upon these points; Apollonius had placed the optative before the imperative: Theodosius gave precedence to the imperative because 'the imperatives seem to have indicative forms,' as e.g. ἔτυπτε τύπτε, ἐποίησεν ποίει, ἔβόα βόα, etc.: the relation of the hortatory subjunctive to the imperative.

This subj. is defined as ὑποθετικός 'suggestive,' i.e. hortatory, and here by way of appendix Ch. touches upon the 'interrogative mood' of the 'philosophers' (Protagoras?) and disposes of the same.

The optative is placed before the subjunctive, because it makes τέλειος λόγος (p. 256), the functions of the optative in dependent constr. and oratio obliqua not being considered. And further on Ch. touches on the relation between the different optatives, viz. the future optative alone really maintains its temporal character (μέλλοντος μόνου σημασίαν ἔστιν εἶρεῖν) whereas elsewhere the *durative* character (παράτασις) or the *completed* action (συνπλήρωσις) was brought out: τύπτωμι is defined as μένομι τύπτω, p. 257, l. 32; τετέφειμι = μὴ ἐπιμένομι τύπτω, p. 257, l. 35; τύψαι, p. 258, l. 29-30, = εἰς πέρας τοῦ τύψαι ἔλθοις. The subjunctive (p. 277 *sqq.*) has more than one function or 'meaning' and was designated (ἔλαβε τὴν ὀνομασίαν) as ὑποτακτική from its being construed (ὑποτάττεσθαι) with one of these conjunctions, viz. ἵνα, ὅφρα [ὅπως, ἐάν], ἄν, the prohibitive μὴ, ὅταν, etc. (it was the established custom to cite and to inflect the subjunctive always with ἐάν: ἐάν τύπτω, ἐάν τύπτῃς, etc.); the conditional function being designated as 'dubitative' (διστακτικός): the twofold function of ἵνα with the subjunctive as ἀποτελεστικός and αἰτιολογικός does not strike us³ as very clear.

E. G. SIHLER.

University of the City of New York.

¹ The recent publication of Prof. H. W. Smyth's great work on the Ionic dialect will add especial interest to this part of Hilgard's index.

² ὄνομα πράγματος. The use of πᾶγμα for πράξις is a peculiarity of the technical language of the grammarians from Dionysius Thrax on.

³ Cf. Schoemann, Redetheile, p. 216 *sq.*

POSTGATE'S NEW EDITION OF THE *CORPUS POETARUM LATINORUM*.

CORPVS POETARVM LATINORVM, a se aliisque denuo recognitorum et breui lectionum varietate instructorum, edidit IOHANNES PERCIVAL POSTGATE. Tom. I. Fasc. II. Londini: Sumptibus G. Bell et filiorum. MDCCCXCIV. 9s. net.

THE first volume of the new *Corpus* of the Latin poets is now completed by the issue of its second fasciculus, which contains Propertius and Ovid. The general editor, as before, is Professor Postgate, who has himself revised the text of Propertius, and has added a select *apparatus criticus*: the overwhelming mass of Ovid has been entrusted to five editors, Prof. Arthur Palmer, Mr. G. M. Edwards, Mr. Gilbert A. Davies, Mr. Sidney G. Owen, and Mr. A. E. Housman. Mr. Housman's share in the whole work, however, is by no means to be measured by the proportion of the text which has been assigned to him. From the first page to the last his hand appears in countless suggestions, in the text or in the notes, always acute and scholarly, sometimes convincing. The multiplicity of editors has given a personal interest of its own to the book: the differences go far beyond the minor matters which are frankly mentioned in the preface, and I think beyond the differences between the texts here dealt with. You have excellent work of the most varied kind: now the latest form of the forward movement in textual criticism (a development which has yet to prove its claims), and now a somewhat conservative attitude. The need for brevity, however, has placed more than one editor at a disadvantage: there is rarely an opportunity to justify a new proposal, and in any case little more is possible than a meagre citation of references.

Orthography is treated in the text of both authors with an obvious inconsistency, which is perhaps wise. The attempt to bring in uniformity of spelling, which in a single author is open to the most serious difficulties and doubts, would be doubly impracticable in a *Corpus*. The true principle has never been more forcibly stated than by Munro, and that which he showed to be true of the text of Lucretius is essentially true of Propertius and Ovid.

In the present case we are told that the principle has been:—'*prava omnia eicienda, sinceræ antiquitatis uera uestigia aut*

seruanda aut certe non occulenda' (pref. viii.); but otherwise, apparently, to follow the readings of the MSS., comparatively late as they are. Assimilation is an exception, but *committo*, *compita*, *improbus*, *assiduus*, *alloquio*, etc. are found every here and there. As the termination of the nom. and acc. pl., *-is* appears commonly, *-es* much more rarely. The form *duplicei* is preserved in Prop. III. (IV.) i. 22. *Equum* occurs a few times, and *equos* (nom. sing.), but *equus* usually: and similarly *oblicus* and *anticus*, etc. In Prop. IV. (V.) iv. 1 and 15, the form *Tarpeiæ* is, no doubt rightly, restored, on Mr. Housman's suggestion, from *tarpelle*, the reading of F; and the same form is printed, without mention of the authority, in l. 29; but in l. 1 *Tarpeium*, and *Tarpeia* in 81 and 93.

It will be convenient to begin by speaking of the Propertius.

Readers of the *Classical Review* have had the opportunity lately of becoming acquainted with Dr. Postgate's views, as well as Mr. Housman's, on the MSS. It is enough to say briefly here that he uses in the *Corpus*, with certain additions, those which Bährens quotes; viz. N=Neapolitanus: A=Vossianus 38: F=Laurentianus plut. 36, 49: D=Daventriensis 1792: V=Ottoboniano-Vaticanus 1514. N is regarded as the best—on this point I should rather accept the view for which Mr. Housman has so elaborately argued—and for the portion of the text which is missing in it, IV. (V.) xi. 17-76, the readings of two cognate MSS. are given. These are the 'Memmianus, cod. Parisin. 8233,' written in 1465, = μ , now used for the first time; and 'Vrbinas 641, saec. xv.' = ν . L='cod. Holkhamicus 333,' is added to the MSS. regularly quoted. See Dr. Postgate's collation of it, with some account of μ and ν , in the *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, vol. iv. Part I. The gain from L is not great, but it serves to confirm the evidence of F. Under the symbols f, d, v, n, l the correctors of F, D, V, N, L are quoted occasionally.

The multitude of the 'interpolated' MSS. have caused some difficulty, because Bährens has omitted to say which of them are denoted by his symbol ς . The *Corpus* therefore names such codices, if they are known, whenever it quotes them. Readings in the text for which no authority is given, though

they differ from the good MSS., are understood to be corrections universally accepted, due to the Italian scholars of the Renaissance, sometimes quoted as 'Itali.'

It may be well to mention a difference in the use of the symbol O, which might cause confusion if not noticed. Bährens defines his practice thus: 'O = archetypus saeculo xiv. repertus, ex consensu siue omnium codicum siue bonorum ADFm.1 Vm.1 (oppositis NFm.2 Vm.2) restitutus.' *Prolegg.* p. liv. That is, I find, when a reading is ascribed by him to O and nothing is reported as to N, the reading of N is left in uncertainty, although it may generally be the same, and is so in all cases which I have used as tests. It was natural that Bährens, with his low estimate of N, should treat it with this comparative neglect.

With Dr. Postgate the case is different. In the *Corpus*, he adds to the list of MSS. to be quoted the 'Holkhamicus' = L, which begins at II. xxi. 3: whereas A = Vossianus, which is of the same family, ends II. i. 63. He uses the symbols Φ = agreement of A and F, or of F and L: Δ = agreement of D and V: O = agreement of Φ and Δ : and Ω = agreement of O and N (or of O and $\mu\nu$ in the passage where N fails).

In Dr. Postgate's collation of L (*Cambridge Philological Society's Transactions*, vol. iv. 1) O is said to be used as = AFDV, —it should be = (A)FDV, since A is lost in all the part covered by L—and where N is not mentioned expressly, its reading is left uncertain. For instance, in III. ii. 14 'et O,' III. ix. 9 'animosa fingere O,' IV. (V.) viii. 11 'colligit O,' the reading of N, though not named, is different from that of FDV; but in a good many cases it is the same, e.g. III. iii. 5, IV. (V.) viii. 8, etc. Here and there Dr. Postgate notes that O disagrees with N.

The last fifteen years in particular have been fertile in Propertian criticism, and the need to sift this and select the best of the results was very great. The task has been performed by Dr. Postgate with remarkable skill: his *apparatus criticus*, in spite of the obvious need for brevity, is helpful in an extraordinary degree, and it has rarely happened to me to look in vain for a mention of any recent conjecture that had been noted as valuable. Individual preferences will always exist; but, speaking generally, the sanity of judgment shown in this matter seems to me most striking. It is natural and right that Mr. Housman should take a very prominent place among the modern critics cited. Extensive use has also been

made of the earlier commentators, Heinsius and Markland especially, and, in the matter of transpositions, Scaliger.

The first impression on reading Dr. Postgate's text is that he has been much more conservative than Bährens in the matter of verbal conjecture; the next, that he employs transposition to an extent which is perhaps unexampled. On the latter point I shall have something to say. Apart from it, the new text commends itself greatly; there is balance and sound judgment; no timidity, certainly, in the admission of conjectures, but extremely little that could be called fanciful or rash. In the vexed questions of the division of poem from poem Dr. Postgate agrees to a great extent with Bährens, and like him assumes the existence of many lacunae. Short passages, generally of two or four lines, are also marked in about twenty-four instances as 'genuina sed suo loco mota.'

The books are treated as four, and 'Cynthia' is restored as the title of the first. The numbers commonly used where the division is into five books are added in brackets.

A small proportion only out of Bährens' multitudinous conjectures have been adopted: but the number after all is considerable, and it may be observed that many of these have gained ground in the editor's estimation on longer familiarity, after being rejected in Prof. Postgate's *Select Elegies* (ed. 2) of 1885. Prof. Arthur Palmer's influence is also felt, in a minor degree. The new conjectural readings are numerous, if account is taken of all that have not been printed hitherto in any text. They are characterized generally by a certain care and caution; there are many instances of nearer approximation to the manuscript readings, and occasionally one of a return to the MSS. Not many, perhaps, of the novelties are of first-rate importance taken singly: hardly anything has struck me as so neat and convincing as Prof. Ellis' Vna Clytaemestrae stuprum uel adultera Cressae | portat mentitae lignea monstra bouis (see *Journ. of Philology* ix. 237 and xix. 177), formerly rejected and now at last adopted in the text of IV. (V.) vii. 57.

In Book I. an interesting change is found in *El.* xxi., where Dr. Postgate seems to have dropped (and rightly, beyond question) the difficulty he formerly raised as to *quacumque* in l. 9, and has cleared up the meaning of 5 and 6 by an emendation:

sic te seruato possint gaudere parentes
ut soror acta tuis sentiet e lacrimis,

for *nec...sentiat* of the MSS. The dying Gallus adjures the unknown comrade who is passing: 'As you would have your parents rejoice in your safety, let your tears tell my sister of my fate: tell her that of all the bones she may find on the Etruscan hills, it is the bones lying here that are mine.' The use of the future is a little difficult, but need raise no objection. The comparative rarity of this construction with *sic*, instead of *ita*, would easily lead to a corruption.

Some minor changes of the text in Book I. are: i. 36 *torum* (Otto), ii. 13 *resplendent*, iv. 26 *decus* (Kraffert, 'cf. Stat. S. 3, 5, 69'), xv. 21 *delata* (with some inferior MSS.), xvi. 23 *noctis* (Housm. i.e. gen. sing. cf. Ov. Am. 1, 6, 44) which is neat, xvii. 28 *pectoribus* (Housm.), xviii. 27 *pro quo mi nudi* (*nudi* from Markland), xix. 13 *illic formosus ueniant chorus heroinae* (Housm.) a great improvement to the Latin, xx. 3, 4 *fortuna occurrit amanti | crudelis*; Minuis *hic erat Ascanius*, ('*hic* = *talis*'), 12 (non minor *Ausonias est amor Hydríadas*).

In II. i. 47 *uno* of MSS. is kept, with the note '*=uni*.' This though possible seems unlikely, from its extreme ambiguity in the context. ii. 4 *ignosco pristina furta tua*; so the second hand of NV: all best MSS. *ignoro*. Is the construction to be justified? 6. *ut* for *et* of MSS.: a distinct loss to the sense as a whole, vi. 5 *disiectas* (Schrader), 41 *seducet* (Birt), vii. 15 *quod si nostra meae comitarent castra puellae*, and 16 *sat nauis...iret equus* (Housm.), ix. 12 *appositum fluuiis in Simeo* (Guyetus, Housm.), *uagis* (Unger), 44 *erit...nihil*, x. 23 *laudis conscendere in arcem* (Birt), xii. 6 *hau uano corde* (Nodell), xiii. 38 *quam fuerant Phthii* of the MSS. is retained, but with the note '*funere quam* Housm. recte ut uid,' 55 *formosus*, xv. 37 *interea*, xvii. 11 [9 is a misprint] *adridente* 'cf. Mart. v. 6, 2,' xviii. 10 *nec*, 29 *deme* (from MS. Par. 7989), xix. 18 *Veneris* (Housm.) *ponere uota*, xx. 8 *nec tantum Niobae...sollicito lacrimans defluit os Sipyló* (Housm.), 35 *haec mihi perpetuo laus est*, xxi. 12 *eiect Aesonía*, xxii. 17 a semicolon after *natura*, xxiii. 22 *pigenda*, 23 *nulla illam restat amante*: the sense is helped, but not without offence to the ear, xxiv. 1 *tu quereris*, 4 *a*, *pudor ingenuis haur reticendus amor*, 8 *urerer et quamuis non bene*, *uerba darem* (Housm.), xxv. 17 *at nullo teritur, durae sub limine amor qui | restat*, 43 *uidistis patriam Argiuas prodente figura* (Housm.), xxvi.^b 31 = 11 *unum littus erit positus torus* (Housm.), 49 *amplexae* ('*passiuo genere*'), xxvii. 7 *rursus et obiectum fles tu caput esse tumultu*, a distinct

improvement, as nearer to the MSS., xxviii.^c 62 a colon after *uotiuas*, xxix. 1 *Hesternó modo cum potu sub nocte uagarer*, 7 *sed nudi hi fuerant*, 21 *atque ita me in tectum duxerunt rursus amicae* (W. Fischer), 27 *intactae*, xxx. 20 *litora muta* ('coll. Sen. H.F. 540'), xxxii. 2 *sic tibi me*, 5 *cur nocte Herculeum deportant esseda Tibur*, 16 *quam subito* (Housm.), 23 *de te nostras mala iecit ad aures | rumor*, 35 *quamuis Ida, Rhea, pastorem dicat amasse | ...deam*, xxxiii. 8 *nullas quid sit inire uias*, xxxiv. 1 *Cur quisquam faciem dominae nunc credit amori?* 13 *corpus*, 15 *pectoris*, 17 *lecto te socium*, xxxiv.^b 29 *aut quid Crethei tibi prosunt carmina plectri?*

These emendations may give an idea of the whole. A few are perhaps unnecessary: but there are some which seem likely to meet with general acceptance.

How far is wholesale, minute, and complex transposition consistent with the principles of modern textual criticism? This is a question which is forced upon the reader by Dr. Postgate's treatment of Book IV. (V.) and of some few earlier elegies of Propertius; the epithets used are meant to be taken literally, as a temperate statement—so at least I hope—of the position. I lay little stress on the fact that I have not found these rearrangements, on the whole, convincing, although some were familiar beforehand, and it was obvious that some might be strongly supported by arguments drawn from a real or supposed connexion of thought. A discussion of the rearranged text on its merits is impossible in this paper; the changes, if the method employed is sound, require deliberate consideration, and I am prepared to find that time, with further explanation, may in more than one passage modify present ideas. First of all we are confronted by the question already named, even if it is assumed that the difficulties of the common order are real and serious, that a transposition which removes one set of difficulties has not created another equally formidable, and that the sense of all the rearranged passages is good, i.e. such as Propertius may probably have intended.

No question need be raised here as to the minor and the occasional—or systematic—transpositions that are consistent with the ascertained facts of manuscript tradition, or that correct a displacement of which some reasonable hypothesis has been framed. But the transpositions of Dr. Postgate's IVth book, taken as a whole, seem to me to go far beyond the possibility

of explanation on any hypothesis which I have seen, or have been able to frame for myself. Such an enormous disarrangement of the text of Book IV. as these transpositions must imply, so great, so persistent, so irregular, and so intricate, would be a phenomenon not easy to account for, and not easily credible, unless on evidence. Vague phrases, such as are familiar, do not meet the present case: nor even such a weighty expression of view as that made in a well-known article by H. A. J. Munro (*Journal of Philology*, 1875, vol. vi.). And what evidence can there be? The consensus of critics? Lachmann retracted the whole of his transpositions, Munro condemns all but one of them, and himself proposes others: the present edition accepts what Munro thought impossible, and so on.

Peerkamp may possibly have pushed the method of transposition as far, though—speaking from impression—I should say that even his reconstruction of the *Epistola ad Pisones* is much less intricate—and he recognizes the uncertainty of his results so far as to print the text first of all in the traditional order. The changes of order in Propertius which Lütjohann has proposed recently are moderate compared with those made in the *Corpus*: and Otto, in his elaborate papers, keeps within bounds. Professor Palmer, and L. Müller, transpose to a small extent only. Bährens, who has seldom been thought to err on the side of timidity, changed the order of lines more or less in about twenty elegies: Dr. Postgate does so in about forty, and his transpositions are in most cases, especially in Book IV. (V.), far more elaborate and complex. Some sort of comparison may have its interest.

In Book I. there is little to notice: Elegies vii., viii. and xv. are slightly altered by Dr. Postgate, the last in close agreement with Bährens.

In Book II. transposition is used in Elegies i., iii., iv., viii., ix., xiii., xv., xvi., xvii., xviii., xxvi.^b, xxviii., xxx., xxxi., xxxiv. Bährens agrees with this in viii., in part of xviii., and xxxi.: he modifies the order of i. and xxvi.^b, and in xxvi.^a places lines 13—18 after 10, where Dr. Postgate makes no change.

In Book III. (IV.) Dr. Postgate's changes are prominent in El. v., which is arranged 1, 2, 5, 4, 3, 6—39, 42, 41, 40, 43—48: El. vii.: 1—8, 43—66, 17, 18, 9—12, 67—70, 13—16, 25—32, 35, 36, 19—24, 33, 34, 37, 42, 71, 72: and El. xi.: 1—35, 40, 37, 39,

36, 41—46, 51—58, 47, 48, 67, 68, 59, 60, 49, 50, 65, 66, 61—64, 69—72.

Minor changes are made in Elegies iii., iv., vi., viii., ix., xiv., xv., xvi., xix., xx., xxi.

Bährens agrees in xvi. altogether, in xi. down to line 46, and in most of xv. and xx.

In Book IV. (V.), El. i. Dr. Postgate prints 1—10, 55, 56, 37, 38, 11—30, 33—36, 61—68, 57—60, 69—70, 87, 88, 39, 40, 47—54, 41—44, 31, 32, 45, 46, 71—86, 89—140, 143, 144, 141, 142, 145—150.

In Bährens: 1—33, 36, 35, 34, 37—150: with a lacuna marked after 29, 38, 54, 86, 88: and a division after 70.

El. ii.: 1—4, 51—54, 49, 50, 55, 56, 5—18, 41—46, 19—40, 47, 48, 57—64.

(No change in Bährens.)

A similar amount of change, sometimes more sometimes less, is made by Dr. Postgate in Elegies iii., iv., v., vii., viii., ix., x. The vith is unaltered. The 'Queen of the Elegies,' the xith, appears in the following order:—

1—3, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 9—17, 50—54, 19, 20, 49, 18, 21—32, 43, 44, 33—42, 47, 48, 45, 46, 55—62, 97, 98, 65, 66, 99, 100, 73, 74, 63, 64, 75—96, 69, 70, 67, 68, 71, 72, 101, 102. A lacuna is marked after 38.

Mr. Housman in 1887 (*Journal of Philology*, xvi. 16) arranged the lines thus: 1—18, 47—54, 19—32, 43, 44, 33—36, 45, 46, 37—42, 55—62, 97, 98, 65, 66, 99, 100, 69, 70, 73, 74, 63, 64, 75—96, 67, 68, 71, 72, 101, 102.

Bährens deals less freely with the xith Elegy: his order is 1—60, 65, 66, 61—64, 67, 68, 71, 72, 69, 70, 73—102. In Elegies iv., v. and ix. he has some transpositions, about half of the number of those in the text now before us.

The purpose of this long list of figures is to give something like due prominence to a bold and able attempt. It was not till a definite comparison was made and set out in order that the nature as well as the quantity of the present changes came home to me. The extension of the method is of some importance, whether it is to succeed or to fail. It does appear difficult to believe that heroic remedies, such as these conjectural rearrangements, are consistent in principle with that scrupulous interpretation of the manuscript evidence which is more and more thought a necessity in emendations of a word or a phrase. This method seems very nearly akin to the loose though often brilliant guesses of which earlier times were more tolerant than the scholars of our own day.

It is something of a paradox to question, on obvious and elementary grounds, the soundness of the method employed by a scholar such as Dr. Postgate, of whom I certainly wish to speak with all respect. The only apparent explanation is that the concentration in one view of that which before was scattered will make the strength or weakness of a method manifest for the first time in a striking fashion.

There are of course minor considerations which cannot be entirely forgotten. A Corpus is not the happiest place for extensive innovations, least of all for those which make reference difficult: and it must be confessed that the maze of figures is baffling in certain elegies. Even when the scattered lines have been found, the reconstruction of

a passage in the old order, and the recovery of the old connexion of thought, takes time which one might have wished to spend otherwise. These are real disadvantages, and will long remain so. No doubt, if the new order comes to be accepted as the standard, the inconvenience will have been simply that which is involved in every change. Such a view is probably too sanguine. But after all, in spite of some drawbacks, a warm welcome is due to such an important and suggestive piece of work as Dr. Postgate's *Propertius*.

Some remarks upon the new text of Ovid, which also presents features of interest, are unavoidably deferred for the moment.

T. W. JACKSON.

Oxford.

(To be continued.)

TWO EDITIONS OF THE *GERMANIA* OF TACITUS.

Cornelii Taciti de Germania, edited with Introduction, Notes, and Map, by HENRY FURNEAUX. Clarendon Press: 1894. 6s. 6d.

THE aim and scope of this volume are clearly indicated in the editor's preface. Originally undertaken with a view to the requirements of the higher forms in schools, it was considerably enlarged in the course of preparation; and in the form in which it is published—on a scale uniform with Mr. Furneaux's well-known edition of the *Annals*—it certainly has all the appearance of being an exhaustive and really comprehensive edition. The editor apologizes for the 'incompleteness which thorough students will easily detect' in his work, but he may be assured that they will rather admire the thoroughness with which it has been executed. Especially will they appreciate the moderation and self-restraint that have gone to the shaping of a book which might have easily been made more bulky, but hardly more useful. It is not really indispensable for an editor to incorporate in his commentary the views of every one who has preceded him,¹ or to read and cite the title of every German monograph that

bears on any point connected with his subject; but while not pretending to original authority in matters outside the special province of classical study, Mr. Furneaux deserves credit for making a most judicious use of the best available materials in the domain of archaeology, law, and history, as well as for illuminating the text of the treatise with the light of his own scholarship. The result is that he has omitted nothing, so far as I can judge, essential to the realization of the wish which he set before himself in editing the *Germania* for English readers,—the wish namely, 'constantly to indicate its importance, almost as great to us as to the Germans themselves, as bearing on the early history of so many of our institutions, and to illustrate from these as much as possible.'

The *Germania* is just such a paper as might have been read to a 'Royal Geographical Society,' had such a society existed at Rome towards the end of the first century of our era. It is improbable, indeed, that it was based upon any extensive personal travel in the country itself: though there are passages which give the impression that the writer is speaking as an eye-witness of what he describes. Mr. Furneaux is right in pointing out that Tacitus 'lays no claim to independent knowledge' but professes to state only what

¹ One sentence in a note on p. 63 will be considered by many a pleasing contrast to some recent editions: 'Several other alterations of the text have been suggested.'

he 'received' from others (*haec...accepimus* 27 § 3). But much had been done under Domitian and Trajan to make Germany better known to the Romans; and apart from what he may have been able to gather at Rome from those of his countrymen who had served there, or who had traded with the interior, Tacitus may have had opportunities of acquiring information more or less at first hand if, as is sometimes supposed to be the case, he included the German border in his travels during the years in which he is known to have been absent from the capital (A.D. 90-94). In his section on the 'Purpose of the Treatise,' Mr. Furneaux gives his weight to the suggestion that the *Germania* was not undertaken without a political reference. Much is often said of the ethical motive which was also obviously at work, and which comes out in many phrases where the stern moralist implies a contrast between German virtue and the laxity of German manners (see introd. p. 30); but the political purpose should also be noted. Trajan had called a halt in the forward policy of his predecessor: he seems to have 'considered that the existing position was perilous, and that circumstances might make the German race formidable even for aggression.' It may well have been in support of the imperial policy that Tacitus produced his treatise, written partly, at least, with the aim of 'familiarizing the public mind with the vast extent and overwhelming numbers of the tribes of Germany, the climatic, physical, and economical obstacles to its invasion and subjugation, the heroic courage of its people, and the blows which they had inflicted on Rome during more than two hundred years without any substantial conquest of their territory.' *Regno Arsacis acrior est Germanorum libertas*: and the historian is forced to own 'in words that at the end of another century must have seemed prophetic, that only the internal discords of the race could avert the destiny which was hurrying the Roman Empire to its destruction' (33 § 2).

Much the most important part of Mr. Furneaux's admirable introduction is that contained in section vi.—the 'Account given by Tacitus and its Value.' We have here a comprehensive summary—with valuable references to modern authorities—of the subject-matter of the treatise, both in its geographical and ethnological aspect and also as containing an account of the political, moral, and social condition of the

early inhabitants of Germany. In his description of their institutions, the editor is careful to emphasize those points in the text which disclose the germs of much that we can recognize as developed in later society, alike in Germany and in England: see especially pp. 20-1 and 26-7, where Kemble, Freeman, and Stubbs are drawn upon for illustration. Similarly, in his explanations of the text, his wide reading has enabled him to include a considerable amount of material that will be of special interest to English readers, as gathering up the results of recent investigations into points of archaeological and legendary lore. He never allows himself to be drawn beyond the limits of legitimate commentary, but on the other hand nothing is omitted that is essential to the adequate interpretation of the text.

For the ordinary matter of commentary, Mr. Furneaux expresses his indebtedness to recent German editions, such as those of Schweizer-Sidler and Zernial. I shall subjoin here a few remarks on what appear to me to be doubtful points of interpretation. It seems misleading to describe the abl. abs. in 1 § 1 as having 'the force of a causal sentence,' unless we assume an ellipse and take *cognitis* as giving the reasons Tacitus has for the description he is furnishing. In dealing with the difficult passage at the end of ch. 2—*ita nationis nomen, non gentis evaluisse paulatim*—Mr. Furneaux fails to take note of the weighty grounds on which H. J. Heller has recently proposed (*Philologus* 1892, p. 340 *sqq.*) to reverse the traditional explanation, and to take *nationis* in the wider, *gentis* in the narrower, sense. The intention of the passage seems to be to indicate that the collective name 'Germani' had a different origin from that of collective names developed out of the designation of some single tribe (*gens*) occupying high place among the peoples of the district to which the collective name comes to be applied. In contrast, for example, with *Ἀχαιοί* or *Ἕλληνες*, the term 'Germani' was applied as a generic and racial appellative (*nationis nomen*) from the first. It was, in fact, devised by the Gauls to characterize the 'shouting warriors' (*gair*, *clamare*) who had dispossessed them of their lands; and the invaders accepted the appellative, applying it in turn to their kinsfolk on the other side of the Rhine, on whose support they still depended to further intimidate (*ob metum*) their Gaulish neighbours. And so it came in course of time to be adopted—

still as an artificially constructed designation (*invento nomine*)—in the home country itself. I shall only add that it might be better to read (with Novak) *cum omnes* for *ut omnes*: *ut* may have been occasioned by *ita* preceding. In 7 § 3 *signa quaedam detracta lucis* is taken (with Müllenhoff and most editors) of the weapons which symbolized the presence of the gods, e.g. the lance of Wuodan, the hammer of Donar, etc.: I have seen it suggested somewhere that the *signa* were sacred banners fastened to spear-shafts, on which such emblems were represented. There seems to be no sufficient reason for departing from the MS. *ut turbae placuit* (11 § 3) in the sense of 'as soon as the crowd thinks fit.' The point seems to be that the crowd is the master of the situation till the priests 'constitute the meeting' by a call for silence: the haphazard character of the proceedings up to that stage is what is meant by *Illud ex libertate vitium*. The emendation *ut turba placuit* adopted by Mr. Furneaux and others ('when the crowd is thought sufficient') would seem to imply the interposition of some form of presidential authority at an earlier stage, and can hardly be supported by *ut campus, ut nemus placuit* in 16 § 3. The collocation in 14 § 4 (*epulae et quamquam incompti largi tamen apparatus*) makes it difficult to take *epulae et...apparatus* as a hendiadys: though that is better than to make *apparatus*, with others, a genitive of quality (*et = eaeque*). In view of such parallels as *Hist.* i. 88 *luxoriosos apparatus conviviorum* and ii. 62 *exhausti conviviorum apparatibus*, it might be proposed to read *epularum* for *epulae et*. An interesting explanation of *eosque [specus] multo insuper fimo onerant*, in 16 § 4, was suggested to me by a description of certain curious caves recently discovered near the racecourse at Goodwood which appeared in the *Daily Graphic* of 6th April, 1895: they are supposed to have been originally excavated to serve the purpose of subterranean repositories such as those which Diodorus Siculus mentions in speaking of the ancient Britons, and their excavation may have led to the discovery of the value for purposes of top-dressing of the chalk manure thus accumulated. In 22 *ad fin.* *salva utriusque temporis ratio est* is surely not 'the regard paid to either time (the advantage accruing from it) is secured': *ratio* = 'conditions' or 'bearings,' and the meaning is that they have the full advantage of both methods of deliberation, the drunk and the sober. Cp. Cic. *pro Cluent.* § 141

exposuit utriusque rationem temporis. In 31 § 1 the use of *haud perinde* can scarcely be explained without assuming the usual ellipse,—here 'atque eae quae modo commemoratae sunt': see Gerber and Greef, p. 1106. In support of Mr. Furneaux's interpretation of *adhuc* in 38 § 1 (*propriis adhuc nationibus*) I may refer to the explanation of the contrast between *natio* and *gens* given above: the Suebi not only consist of various *gentes* (tribes occupying different geographical situations) but they are moreover composed of different 'stocks,' with various names, but known collectively as 'Suebi.' Among minor matters I may refer to some rather faulty renderings of the Tacitean *tamquam* and *velut*: e.g. 8 *ad fin.*, where 'nor as if they were deifying mortals' (for *nec tamquam facerent deas*) fails to express the 'subjective reference' implied: the translation should rather be 'with no idea of.' So *velut deo imperante* in 7 § 2 is inadequately rendered 'as if ordered by the tutelary god': while there is an unnecessary reticence about 'as it were hellish' for *velut infernum* in 43 *ad fin.* In 8 § 3 Vespasian is mistakenly put for Vitellius, as also in the Suetonius reference there given. And in 45 § 6 Halm's misprint *interiacent* for *interlucent* has been somewhat carelessly adopted in the text. From such mistakes, however, the book is otherwise remarkably free; though I may be permitted the further criticism that the editor sometimes follows the Germans in their bad example of over-punctuation, e.g. in the unnecessary commas after *locis* and *civitates* at the opening of ch. 30, and again after *animi civitatum* in 8 § 1.

It is on its critical side that any limitations which the editor may have imposed on himself are at all conspicuous in the volume, and his apology for 'incompleteness' perhaps not altogether superfluous. It was of course inevitable that the text adopted should not differ much from that of Halm, which indeed is followed throughout, except in seven places specified in the preface, p. vi. But there is work to be done among the MSS. of the *Germania*, and a note on introd., p. 2, in which a reference is made to a forthcoming edition of the *Agricola*, prompts the hope that Mr. Furneaux may still intend to undertake that work himself. It would certainly be interesting to see the results obtained by recent editors of the *Dialogus* worked out for both the other minor treatises. Possibly the constitution of the text would not be seriously affected

thereby, but additional light would certainly be thrown on the inter-relationship of the existing codices. Mr. Furneaux seems to accept the view that the representatives of the X family are of highest rank; but Schefczik (whom he nowhere names) anticipated Scheuer in proving for the *Germania* that the Y archetype must have contained the more genuine tradition.¹ The editor might have brought out the fact that the *Hummelianus*, the *Monacensis*, and the *Stuttgardiensis* all belong to the Y family (Scheuer, p. 3): the first-named codex stands to the *Germania* in the same relation as the *Ottobonianus* (E) to the *Dialogus*, while the claim of the Stuttgart codex to primary rank has been quite recently revived in Germany.² Mr. Furneaux seems nowhere to cite specifically *Vaticanus* 4498 (Δ), though he promises to deal with it in his edition of the *Agricola*; it is of little importance for the text as we now have it, but it has an interest of its own for the question of inter-relationship of the codices. The same is true of the two manuscripts at Vienna (V and V_2): Mr. Furneaux is hardly right in saying that these MSS. 'appear to have been unnoticed' by editors of the *Germania*, for the readings of the first are given by Massmann, while those of the second have been transcribed by Huemer, with the result that V_2 has been shown to be nearly related to the *Hummelianus* (Scheuer, pp. 15—17 and 26—7). Reference to the material which recent research has made available might have rendered Mr. Furneaux's critical apparatus fuller (if somewhat more cumbersome) and also occasionally more correct in points of detail—of small importance in themselves, but of interest for the question under discussion. Thus in 2 § 2 (*nisi si patria sit*) the true state of the case is that while ACDM give *nisi si*, B has *nisi* and HV_2S *nisi sibi*. Further down in the same chapter the reading *conditoremque*, adopted from H by Holder, is also found as a correction in V_2 and S: ABCM give *conditorisque* and D *conditoris*. Again in 35 § 1, while ABHMSV₂ all agree in *obtenditur* (*optenditur* B), CAD unite in showing *obtere*, as also *propriis* for *populis* in 40 § 2, and *nec* for *non* in 44 § 3. At 45 § 1 CAD have *in ortus edurat* for *in ortum edurat* AB: HSV₂ show *in ortu*

sedurat, though a later hand in V_2 corrects this to the reading of CAD, while M gives *mortu sedurat*.

W. PETERSON.

P. Cornelii Taciti Germania. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Critical Appendix, by R. F. DAVIS. Methuen and Co. 1894. 2s.

Tacitus, Agricola and Germania, with Introduction and Notes, by H. M. STEPHENSON. Cambridge. 1894. 3s.

THESE handy volumes have been published almost contemporaneously with Mr. Furneaux's larger work, but enter into competition rather with Messrs. Church and Brodribb's well-known little book, which has so long held the field for English students of the minor works of Tacitus. Both are scholarly productions. For the *Germania*, Mr. Davis's edition is specially admirable, and ought to do much to make the treatise better known in our schools. In his succinct introduction, the editor deals with the historical and ethnographical matter of the treatise in a way that shows that he has made excellent use of his authorities, whom he has evidently studied at first hand. The critical appendix is proof that textual questions have received a due share of consideration. Mr. Davis's notes are of a high order of merit, and always judiciously concise. As against Mr. Furneaux, he seems right in interpreting *primum* in ch. 3 as 'the greatest' instead of as 'the prototype' of brave men; and his explanation of *utriusque temporis ratio* ch. 22 *ad fin.* is also to be preferred. But he gives a wrong interpretation of *concessis animalibus* in ch. 9: cites some misleading parallels in support of the erroneous view that in ch. 5 *satis* is a dative: interprets *condicere* in ch. 11 as to 'announce,' though the meaning of 'contract' can hardly be absent: is not so accurate as to *veste distinguuntur* in ch. 17: and does not hit on the suggestion that *principibus* in ch. 22 may = *ducibus*. On the other hand, Mr. Davis supplies some very neat renderings of difficult phrases, which however need not be further particularized. His book has been prepared with great care: I have noted only one misprint, *Agr. ii.* for *xi.* on p. 31.—Mr. Stephenson's book includes the *Agricola* as well as the *Germania*, a treatise already separately edited by Mr. Davis, and always more likely to command attention in schools. His introductions are somewhat meagre, and are 'borrowed almost

¹ *De Taciti Germaniae apparatu critico*, Troppau, 1886, p. 12 sqq.

² Unter den erhaltenen Handschriften der Germania des Tacitus ist Stuttgarter Handschrift die beste: J. Holub, Wei enau, 1895.

entirely' from German editors: it was no part of the editor's aim to compel school-boys to interest themselves in the archaeological and ethnological questions suggested by the text. Hence probably it results that for the *Germania* Latham's notes are sometimes quoted in connection with such matters when later authorities would have carried greater weight. The same considerations have debarred the editor from dealing seriously with textual problems. But there is much interesting matter in Mr. Stephenson's notes, though they sometimes (*e.g.* *Germ.* i. and ii.) err on the side of diffuseness. A schoolboy will be apt to stare when he reads that 'the aphasia of modern society has practically robbed the

English language of the word *awful*' (p. 126): on the other hand he will be amused by 'the imperious Baumstark' (p. 118) and such notes as those on *matrimonium* (p. 136) and *calida* (p. 138) must plainly have been intended to divert him. Space forbids me to add anything further, except to remark that on ch. xx. Mr. Stephenson falls into the common error of interpreting *sordidi* of a discreditable kind of squalor, whereas it seems to point only to an obvious feature of rural life: that *exigitur* in ch. x. means 'demanded' rather than 'tested': and that the reference to Quintilian on p. 151 should be ix. 3, 1.

W. P.

REID'S EDITION OF THE *PRO MILONE*.

M. Tulli Ciceronis pro T. Annio Milone ad indices Oratio. Edited for Schools and Colleges by JAMES S. REID, Litt.D. Cambridge University Press. 1894. 2s. 6d.

SCHOLARS will welcome this addition to the admirable series of speeches and other works of Cicero edited by Dr. James S. Reid. Few of the speeches of Cicero, whether as regards style or matter, were more worthy of Dr. Reid's attention than the highly-laboured oration which he delivered, or rather published, in defence of his friend Milo; and if our admiration of the cleverness and brilliance of the oratory is somewhat damped by the knowledge that Cicero broke down through nervousness in the delivery of it, and so rendered himself open to Milo's well-known taunt about the lampreys of Marseilles, we have the satisfaction on the other hand of knowing that the speech as we have it came forth from the hand of Cicero with the most perfect literary and forensic finish which he could put on it. The popularity of the speech, educationally, is evidenced by the fact that no less than five English editions of it have appeared in the space of two years: a new issue of the late Mr. Purton's edition itself forming a volume in the Pitt Press series; the Clarendon Press edition by Mr. A. B. Poynton; another Clarendon Press edition, important for the text, by Mr. Albert C. Clark; the volume in Messrs. Macmillan's red series by Mr. F. H. Colson; and now the edition by Dr. Reid, in which the Pitt Press

appears (like the Clarendon) as competing with itself.

All these editions have merits of their own; all have been written with a view both to school and college use. But a glance will show that Dr. Reid's book stands on a different level from the rest. It is not properly a school-book; it is not written mainly with a view to boys, or the practical needs of teaching. It is essentially a book for scholars; and its great feature is the remarkable care and completeness with which the delicacies of Ciceronian, or Latin, diction are illustrated from the language of the speech. Not that matters of historical interest are passed over. There is an admirable introduction. Each historical, legal, or other point in the argument which absolutely requires explanation is explained shortly—very often too shortly—or a reference given to an explanation to be found elsewhere. But the brevity, almost the curtness, with which this is done makes it apparent that the main object of the commentator is not to exhibit in a tempting or suggestive form the intellectual food to be extracted from the matter, or the general literary qualities of the speech, but rather to use its language as a peg on which to hang careful and exhaustive statements as to the usage of the best Latin authors on nice points of diction. Thus Dr. Reid's editions are much more than editions of particular speeches: they are important contributions to our scientific knowledge of the language. But the very

completeness with which this is done is apt to divert attention from the issues of the speech itself, is a deterrent to all but advanced scholars, and tends somewhat to promote that subordination of thought to language, of substance to form, which is one of the dangers attendant on modern scientific scholarship. But the book is admirably complete. The comments of Asconius, on which our knowledge of the circumstances of the speech so largely depends, are given in full in one appendix; in another, the structure of the speech, according to the approved rules of rhetoric, is carefully analysed. But it is to be regretted that the running analysis, inserted between the various divisions of the text, is unduly scant—too short to do real justice to the progress of the argument. The analysis in Mr. Purton's edition is much fuller, and more helpful to the student.

But, as a linguistic study, Dr. Reid's edition is of the highest value. A conscientious perusal of every line in text and notes leaves the impression that no single point of doubt or difficulty in the Latin—no unusual expression—has been left unnoticed. The notes are a mine of exhaustively collected information on idiom and syntax; a short comment often gives the results of a complete reading of his author. The exact number of times which a particular form or usage occurs in all Cicero's works, or in Latin literature, is not unfrequently recorded; and, with the utmost desire to pick holes, it would be difficult to find a single passage in which Dr. Reid's interpretation, or his statement of a Latin law, can be seriously disputed. The following points, carefully searched for, may show how unfruitful is the search.

§ 3, p. 15: *incitati sunt* (present perfect).....*quid iudicaretis*, 'Since the decision was still to come, *iudicatis* might have been substituted for *iudicaretis*; but it is rather more usual to assimilate the tense of the subordinate to that of the principal verb.' 'Rather more usual' is scarcely strong enough: it would be more true to say 'almost the invariable rule.' Even after a historical present the imperfect is used, § 11, l. 6: *vetat, ut...quaereretur...iudicaretur*. A most remarkable example is § 70, ll. 20, 21, where the pres. perf. *tulit* is followed by *oporteret, liceret*, even though the subordinate verbs *sentio, confitentur* show that the thought refers wholly to the present. Such cases as § 23, l. 13 *praepositus est...qui disceptet*, are extremely rare.

§ 6, l. 17 (*hoc* explanatory, followed by

ut): 'But *hoc ignoret* is followed by a clause with accus. and infin., below, 8, l. 2. The subj. with *ut* is about as common as the accus. with infin. in such explanatory clauses.' But surely it would be impossible to have an *ut* clause explanatory of *hoc* after a direct verb of knowing or saying. *Hoc ignoret—ut soleat* would scarcely be Latin.

§ 15, l. 10: *defensionem* is rather 'the opportunity of defending himself' than 'a possibility of defence.'

§ 21, l. 6: Is not *fides* rather 'the credit' or 'guarantee' than 'the loyalty'?

§ 28, l. 28: The so-called 'potential' subjunctive can scarcely be explained as being 'really the apodosis to a suppressed protasis, "if we had expressed our desire."' If so, how explain the frequent use of the perf. subj. with a potential sense?

§ 28, l. 16: 'Subjunctives which thus perform two functions are not common.' That is so: but they are the rule with deliberative subjunctives in subordination.

§ 34, l. 15: 'nor did he find me a better canvasser than Clodius': better, 'nor did he find *in me*,' etc.

§ 35, l. 7: '*quid odisset: quid* is a kind of cogn. acc. = *quod odium*.' Why not simply translate 'why?'

§ 39, l. 2: When '*cum* with perf. ind. is followed by a present tense, *cum* has the sense of *quotiens*.' It might have been added that *cum* has the same sense with a pluperf. followed by an imperf.

§ 42, l. 29: '*praesertim cum* in spite of the fact that': a sense equally frequent with the other "particularly as." So in the n. on § 81, l. 29. This is scarcely a sufficient explanation. *Praesertim cum* can only, of itself, mean 'especially since'; when the phrase can be translated by 'in spite of the fact that,' it is only because it qualifies, not the statement just made, but an opposite one suggested by the context. Thus, here, the previous sentence *non dubitavit occidere?* is equivalent to, and suggests the answer, 'He certainly would not have intentionally killed Clodius: especially as (not 'in spite of the fact that') he was a candidate for office at the time.' So exactly § 81, l. 29: *dubitaret id fateri...? praesertim cum*: 'he would certainly have confessed it, especially as,' etc.

§ 56, l. 26: *vitam maximis praemiis praepositam*. Surely *praemiis* here is dat. not abl. By a not unnatural inversion, Cic. speaks of 'the life being set before the highest prospects' instead of the 'highest prospects before the life.'

§ 58, l. 16: *omnibus praemiis* rather 'all

kinds of ' than 'all possible': as *omnibus exitiis*, § 3, l. 13.

§ 82, l. 7: *nostram*, scarcely 'as our due,' but rather, 'would be ours,' 'would fall to us.'

§ 84, l. 12: *mentem incecit ut...auderet*. Can *ut* here be called the *ut* of consequence? Is it not rather the *ut* of definition: 'gave him the mind to dare'?

A few excellent critical notes are given, mainly on points of real interest: and the orthography is pure as usual. But when

did Dr. Reid cease to believe in Quintilian's assertion that Cic. spelt *caussa* not *causa*? See *Pro Sulla*, App. B. Admirable and complete as is this edition, the only regret its perusal leaves behind, as in the case of other so-called school-books like Prof. Palmer's *Satires of Horace*, is that a commentary of such permanent value should be put out in a form so unworthy of its merits.

G. G. RAMSAY.

MAURENBRECHER ON THE SALIAR HYMNS.

Carminum Saliarium Reliquiae, edidit B. MAURENBRECHER. (Commentatio ex supplem. xxi. Annalium Philolog. seorsum expressa.) 8vo. 38 pp. Leipzig, 1894. 1 Mk.

THIS is an extremely lucid and valuable collection of the fragments of the Saliar Hymns, the authorities for their text, and the 'testimonia' of the ancients on the Saliars and their deities generally. It is written in straightforward Latin, with considerable spirit. Dr. Maurenbrecher has rendered a small but lasting service to Latin scholarship by sifting the mass of conjecture that has gathered round these difficult but important remnants of early Latin, and applying to the questions involved not merely a very sane critical judgment but, what is still uncommon among the disciples of Ritschl, a trained acquaintance with the methods of modern Philology. The reader is thus, on the one hand, delivered from what is rightly called 'Hottentot Latin,' to which interpreters like Zander and Corssen have sunk (as when Zander reads '*verom ad palla coemis es*' and interprets 'Thou (oh Janus) art our companion to the open approaches of the doors'); and, on the other, from the loose speculation as to sound-changes which used to be regarded as an indispensable engine for 'operating' with such fragments. The result is a text which is possible Latin throughout, and nearly always convincing (the only point to which the reader will demur, is, I think, the restoration *verod* in the second fragment at the beginning of a half line, in the sense of 'vere,' 're vera');

and a commentary which is brief, sound and suggestive. The date of most of the fragments is fixed as earlier than the Duenos insc., i.e. probably before 350 B.C. It would be unfair to quote the reconstructed text, which is the author's main achievement; also quite needless, as no student of old Latin, from whatever standpoint he approaches it, can afford to be without the essay itself. An index is added, and in point of method and arrangement generally, no less than in substance, the monograph is a model.

In passing I note that the readings *quomne tonas*, *Loucesie*, *adoriso*, and *Cerus* are strongly defended, and the 'syncopation' of *cante*, if that be for *canite*, very plausibly explained as a rude metrical license; but that the phonetic inter-relations of *Halesus*, *Falisci*, *Falerii* forbid us to ascribe to the eponymous hero a purely Greek origin, as seems to be suggested, p. 323, n. 1.

R. SEYMOUR CONWAY.

POSTSCRIPT.

Readers of the *Classical Review* may perhaps be glad to hear that a Pelignian insc. of five lines has just been discovered by de Nino. The impressions he has sent me show that the stone is badly injured, but one line, the fourth, is practically clear; it runs *famel inim loufir* 'servus et liber(-tus?),' forms of some interest in this dialect. Should further impressions render the rest of the text clearer than it is at present, I will publish it in full in the next number.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

WROTH'S CATALOGUE OF GREEK
COINS OF TROAS, AEOLIS, AND
LESBOS.

Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Troas, Aeolis, and Lesbos, by WARWICK WROTH, F.S.A., with one map and forty-three autotype plates. (London. Printed by order of the Trustees of the British Museum, 1894. Pp. lxxxiii. and 260.) 25s.

MR. WROTH'S *Catalogue of the Coins of Mysia* has been followed rapidly by that of the contiguous district of the Troad. Mr. Wroth's name has been for years so connected with numismatic work of the highest order, that his name on the title-page of a catalogue is a safe guarantee that the volume has reached a point of perfection only attainable by one who possesses ability, learning and industry in the highest degree.

Nor will the reader of the present volume of the British Museum Catalogue find any cause for disappointment. In an introduction of some eighty pages Mr. Wroth gives a clear and concise account of the coinage of the very interesting region with which he has to deal. In addition to the cities of the Troad, this Catalogue contains the coinage of the cities of Aeolis and that of the islands of Tenedos and Lesbos.

The coinage of the Troad is first dealt with. It comprises some twenty-three towns exclusive of Abydos, which occupies an isolated position, not falling easily into any group of cities. The other twenty-three towns of the Troad Mr. Wroth treats under three main heads. The coinage of these cities belongs mainly to the fourth century, and to the latter part of the fifth century, B.C. Coins of the sixth century have been ascribed to such towns as Abydos, Cebren, Dardanus, and Zeleia, but in none of these cases is the attribution certain and Mr. Wroth wisely refrains from assuming these plausible and in some cases very probable ascriptions are certain.

The fourth century B.C. was an era of much political change in the Troad, and we can see these political changes well mirrored forth in the coinage.

Mr. Wroth's first group consists of Alexandria Troas, and the adjacent towns. Antigonos, on founding this notable city in 310 B.C. by effecting a kind of

synoekismos by drafting in the populations of Neandria, Hamaxitus, Colone, Cebren, Scepsis, and other towns, called it Antigoneia in his own honour. But ten years later Lysimachus named it Alexandria in honour of Alexander the Great. It is from 300 B.C. that the monetary history of the city takes its rise. No coins are as yet known which bear the name of the town. The currency for the first ten years was furnished by the coinage of two of the absorbed cities, Neandria and Hamaxitus. This is rendered highly probable from the fact that we find as the earliest coin-types of Alexandria Troas those which we find on the latest issues of the mints of Neandria and Hamaxitus—the feeding horse of Neandria and Apollo Smintheus of Hamaxitus. The temple of this deity lay within the territory of Hamaxitus.

As we may naturally expect, the coinage of the towns of the Troad reflects the famous legends connected with the Tale of Troy. Thus have we not merely the Sminthean Apollo, but Hector is found at Ilium Novum, and possibly on some coins of Ophrynum. On the coins of the former town we find the hero represented in various characteristic scenes, such as after slaying Patroclus, standing before the statue of Athene Ilias, or hurling a torch, doubtless against the ships of the Achaeans, or advancing to the fray.

The pious Aeneas bearing his father Anchises on his back is more popular still, for not only do we find him on the coins of Ilium, but also on those of Scepsis and Dardanus. Aeneas usually leads Ascanius by the hand, but Creusa is absent just as the incident is treated by Virgil. Types referring to their chief natural products appear on the coins of certain towns. Thus Mr. Wroth is certainly right in explaining the ear of wheat found on the coins of Assus, Neandria, Alexandria Troas, and Gergis as a reference to the fame of these cities for growing wheat (p. xxix.). On like principles he explains (p. xxxi.) the infant Dionysus playing with a bunch of grapes, not as evidence of the prevalence of Dionysiac orgies at Ophrynum, but as referring to its wealth in wine. 'In all probability the vineyards of Ophrynum produced excellent wine, like those of the modern Renkioi.' It is especially gratifying to the

present writer to find Mr. Wroth explaining corn and grape types on the principles which he ventured to put forward in his *Metallic Currency* when dealing with the types of Metapontum, Thasos, Chios, and other places. But his satisfaction is still greater in finding that when Mr. Wroth has to explain the mussel or oyster on the coins of Grynium, he does not say that it is a symbol of Poseidon, but, far better, quotes Pliny (*H. N.* xxxii. 6, 21), who mentions *ostrea* in the neighbourhood of Grynium and Myrina: *ostrea . . . gaudent dulcibus aquis et ubi plurimi influunt amnes. gignuntur tamen et in petrosis carentibusque aquarum dulcium aduentu, sicut circa Grynium etc.*

Yet Mr. Wroth will not admit my explanation of the tunny-fish on the coins of Cyzicus as referring to that fish being the chief article of trade at that city, a fact abundantly proved, but maintains that the Cyzicene tunny has a distinctly religious signification. From his way of treating the shell on the coins of Grynium, we may hope that he is steadily growing in grace, and is shaking off the trammels of a method which saw religious symbols in everything.

He might have applied with advantage the newer principle to the fir-tree found on coins of Scamandria, Scepsis (xxiv.v.), Antandrus. In one case he seems on the right track and thinks it refers to the forests of Ida. This region was so famous for its good ship-timber that the explanation of the fir-tree as referring to the principal product seems almost certain. Just as he gets on the right track Mr. Wroth says 'its mythological significance is uncertain, unless indeed it is connected with the Dionysus who appears on some of the later coins of Scepsis.'

The renowned isle of Tenedos naturally is taken in conjunction with the Troad. The coinage appears to extend from 550 to 387 B.C. The Janiform head and the bipennis on the reverse are almost the only types from first to last. Numismatists have laboured much over these types. The double head has been explained as representing Tennes and his sister; others take it as dimorphic Dionysus. Such Janiform heads are not confined to Tenedos, but are found at Lampsacus, Athens, Syracuse, Etruria. The axe has been very variously explained as a religious symbol, but although Mr. Wroth will not accept my explanation that the dedication of such axes at Delphi by the Tenedians pointed to the axe being once one of the chief products of the place and used for

money as in Homer, he is not satisfied with any of the religious explanations. It is hardly likely that if the axe was sacred to either the Carian Zeus or Pagasean Dionysus it would have been selected for dedication at Delphi. Articles once used as money continued to be dedicated at Delphi. Thus Rhodopis dedicated *ἄβελαι* just as Pheidon had dedicated his spits at the Heraeum.

One of the most interesting parts of Mr. Wroth's book is his treatment of the coinage of Lesbos. The well-known series of anepigraphic billon coins which have been long assigned to Lesbos on good grounds he places between 550 and 450 B.C. Those bearing a boar's head or two boars' heads facing a tree between them have been usually assigned to Methymna, while those with a calf's head facing a tree have been assigned to the great rival city of Mytilene. These coins also exhibit some other very interesting types, such as a negro's head, and a human eye, or sometimes two eyes. Although there is here a tempting opportunity for the mythologists to explain the blackamoor as a solar symbol, and for quoting appropriately

'Mislike me not for my complexion,
The shadowed livery of the burnished sun,
To whom I am a neighbour and near bred,'

Mr. Wroth wisely leaves the type unexplained. The occurrence of the human eye and negro on the same coin would almost induce one to suggest that both are due to some Egyptian influence. The eye recalls the well-known Egyptian amulet, called *uchat*, whilst the negro's head reminds us of at least one statuette from Naukratis, portraying a negro. The appearance of the IHS, copied from Jesuit medals, on certain Thibetan coins illustrates how religious symbols of one people may get on the coins of another. But after all it is a far cry to Egypt from Lesbos, and my suggestion has no evidence to back it up. Whatever may be the origin of the negro's head at Lesbos, the true explanation must also apply to the same type on coins of Delphi.

The billon coins of Lesbos are struck on two standards, 236 and 171 grs. respectively, called by Mr. Head the Phoenician and Persic. According to Lenormant the amount of silver in these coins is about 40 per cent. Now it is worth while pointing out that at that rate the billon coin of 236 grs. is worth 94.4 grains of silver, or in other words an Aeginetic drachm, whilst similarly a billon coin of 171 grs. = 68.4 grs. of

silver, or a drachm of the Attic standard. Now there is a 6th century silver coin with a boar's head assigned to Methymna by Mr. Head (p. lxxv. note) which weighs 92 grs., and again the earliest silver coins of Methymna, struck about 500 B.C., weigh 132.5 grs. or Attic stater. The series of billon with calves' heads are on the 171 grs. standard = Attic drachm of pure silver. This coincidence is striking. It would seem that the so-called Aeginetic standard was in use at Lesbos in the 6th century for silver, but that by 500 B.C. the so-called Attic had come in. We may therefore with some probability assign to the 6th the billon coins of the 236 grs., and to the fifth those of 171 grs. That the Greeks were careful to regulate the weight of their coins according to the amount of alloy is also shown by the relations between the pure gold stater or Daric and the Cyzicene electrum staters, first pointed out by Prof. Gardner. The Greeks of the 4th century B.C., as I have shown elsewhere, thought they could tell accurately even to $\frac{1}{14}$ th part what amount of alloy was in the stater.

Mr. Wroth places the beautiful series of Lesbian electrum hecets between 480 and 350 B.C., a view to which Mr. Head now inclines. Mr. Wroth gives some good reasons for objecting to M. J. P. Six's date of 550 B.C. as too early, whilst he wisely follows the classification of the hecets into three groups, adopted by Mr. Head. The autotype plates are excellent. Pls. xxxii.-xxxiv. containing most of the hecets in the museum are especially noteworthy.

WILLIAM RIDGEWAY.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GERMANY.

Mayence.—A small Roman altar of very fine limestone has been unearthed. The inscription is partly legible, and states that one Q. Atilius has paid his vow to the Nymph, probably of the pond near which the altar was found. The date is the first century after Christ. A second votive altar, together with fragments of Roman gravestones, has also been found. This altar was dedicated by L. Majorius Cogitatus to the Deae Aufaniae, who were Gallo-German divinities, and were venerated as benevolent unseen mothers. One of the gravestones states that Gaiulus of Virunum (*i.e.* Zollfeld near Klagenfurth, Carinthia), a soldier of the 22nd Legion, thirty-one years in service, and fifty-five years old, was there buried.¹

GREECE.

Athens.—Dörpfeld reports that the passage discovered under the orchestra of the theatre of Dionysos are not the *Χαρώνεια κλίμακες*, as was

supposed, but had been already destroyed when the theatre was erected. In a well-like hole in the middle of the orchestra numerous fragments of Mycenaean vases were found. The same authority has discovered that the front wall of the *σκηνή* in the theatre of Lyeurgos was decorated with eighteen columns, the *παράσκηνα* on either side with six; and the proscenium was originally movable.²

Between the Pnyx and the Areopagus, in front of the spot where the Enneakrounos was localized, a late Roman building has been found, there being no traces of an earlier one below. It also appears that there was an open space here left free for the water running from the fountain, and the conduits for carrying it off still exist; on a higher level are remains of a basin of the Roman period. Several graves of the latter part of the sixth century were found here, containing lekythi and other b.f. vases. No traces of the Eleusinian were found in the neighbourhood, as had been expected, but remains have come to light which are believed to be the sacred precinct of Dionysos *ἐν Ἀλφειῶνι*.³

Eleusis.—A remarkable discovery has been recently made here in the course of the excavations, in the shape of a terracotta plaque with pedimental top. It is painted in the style of the later Athenian red-figured vases, about 400 B.C., and is in wonderfully good preservation. On the base is inscribed *Μυῖαν ἀνέθηκεν*. In the pediment is a figure of Artemis, and below are four female figures carrying the large torches known as *Βάκχοι* (*cf.* the vase F 68 in the British Museum); these figures evidently represent performers in the Eleusinian mysteries. Thus the plaque is not only artistically interesting, but also on account of its bearing on this difficult question, and it is hoped that a correct interpretation of the subject will throw fresh light on it.⁴

Aphidna.—Fragments of Mycenaean vases have been found on the top of the Acropolis; also a tumulus has been investigated containing two pit-shaped graves, three graves of hewn stone, and seven *κίβητες* in which the corpses were placed. They contained pottery of a primitive type, with geometrical patterns, incised and painted.⁵

Epidaurus.—Excavations are being made on the site of the Stadium, which is being gradually cleared. The marble seats along the sides are being brought to light, and the *carceres* at the end have been exposed, in which are a number of marble columns *in situ*. The work is being done by the Greek Archaeological Society.

EGYPT.

Mr. Grenfell has brought back some more fragments of the great Revenue papyrus, and a number of family papers of the same date as that now in the British Museum which concerns the property of one Druton (latter half of second cent. B.C.). Among them is the actual will of Druton, also several contracts made by him, dated in the early years of Ptolemy Soter II. The whole series of Ptolemy's ancestors is given, such complete series being very rare. Mr. Wilbour has found a fragment of a stone completing an inscription, the other part of which was in Berlin; it was found at Dimeh in the Fayum and dates from 104 B.C. It relates to a votive offering of one Dionysius to Isis and Harpocrates in commemoration of the completion of some road-building operations.⁶

H. B. WALTERS.

² *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 11 May.

³ *Ibid.* 25 May.

⁴ *Athenaeum*, 25 May.

⁵ *Ibid.* 1 June.

¹ *Athenaeum*, 8 June.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Arnold* (E. V.) and *Conway* (R. S.) The restored pronunciation of Greek and Latin, with tables and practical explanations. 8vo. 24 pp. Sewed. Cambridge Press. 1s.
- Cicero*. De Finibus. Book II. Edited by J. D. Maitland. 12mo. 106 pp. Clive. 3s. 6d.
- Speech in defence of Cluentius. Translated into English, with an introduction and notes. Post 8vo. 230 pp. Macmillan. 5s.
- Holm* (A.) The history of Greece, from its commencement to the close of the Independence of the Greek Nation. Translated from the German. 4 vols. Vol. 2. Fifth century, B.C. 8vo. 536 pp. Macmillan. 6s. net.
- Horace*. Epodes. Edited by J. Thompson. Post 8vo. 60 pp. Clive. 1s. 6d.
- Horace*. Odes and Epodes. A close translation with test-papers (Odes, by A. H. Alcroft: Epodes, by J. Thompson.) Cr. 8vo. Clive. 2s. 6d.
- North* (M. A.) and *Hillard* (A. E.) Latin Prose Composition. For the Middle Forms of Schools. Post 8vo. 280 pp. Rivington. 2s. 6d.
- Orid*. Tristia. Book III. Edited, with explanatory notes and vocabulary by E. S. Shuckburgh. 18mo. 140 pp. Macmillan. 1s. 6d.
- Sophocles*. Ajax. Edited by J. H. Haydon. Post 8vo. 108 pp. Clive. 3s. 6d.
- Thucydides*. Book I. A close translation, with test-papers, by T. T. Jeffery. Post 8vo. 84 pp. Clive. 3s. 6d.
- Wainwright* (J. B.) Paraphrases from Greek and Latin Poets. 16mo. 34 pp. Blackwell. 1s. 6d.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aelianus* (Claudius.) Les lettres rustiques de Claudius Aelianus, traduites en français par P. Quillard, illustrées d'un avant-propos et d'un commentaire latin. 18mo. 99 pp. Paris.
- Alexandri* Lycopolitani contra Manichaei opinioniones disputatio, ed. Aug. Brinkmann. 12mo. xxxi, 50 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk.
- Anthologiae latinae Supplementa*. Vol. I. Damasi epigrammata. Acced. Pseudodamasiana aliaque ad Damasiana illustranda idonea. Rec. et adnot. Max Ihm. 8vo. lii, 147 pp., 2 plates. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Beschreibung der Skulpturen aus Pergamon. I. Gigantomachie. Herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung der K. Museen zu Berlin. Royal 8vo. iv, 40 pp., engravings, 4 plates. Berlin, Spemann. 1 Mk. 35.
- Buchhold* (Dr. Ludw.) Die Antikensammlungen des grossherzogl. Museums in Darmstadt. 8vo. 152 pp. Darmstadt, Winter. 1 Mk. 50.
- Caesar's* Gallischer Krieg, herausgegeben von Dr. Fr. Fugner. Kommentar. 8vo. vi, 200 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 60.
- Catonis* (M. Porci.) De agricultura liber, recogn. H. Keil. 12mo. v, 88 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk.
- Cicero*. Schieche (Theod.) Zu Cicero's Briefwechsel im Jahre 51. 4to. 31 pp. Berlin, Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- Comes* (Prof. Orazio.) Darstellung der Pflanzen in den Malereien von Pompeji. Aus dem Italienischen übersetzt. 8vo. vii, 68 pp. Stuttgart, Nägele. 3 Mk. 80.
- Demosthenes*. Discours sur la couronne, expliqué littéralement, annoté et revu pour la traduction française par E. Sommer. 16mo. 395 pp. Paris, Hachette. 3 Fr. 50.
- Denkmäler* (Antike.) Herausgegeben vom kais. Deutschen Archaeologischen Institut. Vol. II. Part II. (1893—1894). Folio. 12 plates, 8 pp. letterpress with engravings. Berlin, Reimer. 40 Mk.
- Euripides*. Herakles. Erklärt von Ulr. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. 2nd Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. xv, 273, 296 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 16 Mk.
- Fustel de Coulanges. La cité antique. Étude sur le culte, le droit, les institutions de la Grèce et de Rome. 15e Edition. 16mo. 483 pp. Paris, Hachette. 3 Frs. 50.
- Gerhard* (Ed.) Etruskische Spiegel. Vol. V. Bearbeitet von K. Klügmann und G. Körte. Parts 12 and 13. 4to. 149, 179 pp., 20 plates. Berlin, Reimer. Each 9 Mk.
- Holland* (Dr. Rich.) Heroenvögel in der griechischen Mythologie. Mit einem Anhang über Diomedes in Italien. 4to. 38 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs. 1 Mk. 20.
- Homer*. Odyssee. Für den Schulgebrauch bearbeitet von Dr. Jos. Bach. Text. 8vo. xxx, 283 pp. Cloth. Münster, Aschendorff. 2 Mk.
- Jamblichus*. Le livre de Jamblique sur les mystères. Traduit du grec par P. Quillard. 8vo. xv, 218 pp. Paris. 6 Frs.
- Justinus*. Sorn (Prof. Jos.) Über den Gebrauch der Präpositionen bei M. Junianus Justinus. 8vo. 30 pp. Laibach. 1 Mk.
- Lycophrou's Alexandra, griechisch und deutsch mit erklärenden Anmerkungen von Prof. Dr. C. von Holzinger. 8vo. 427 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 15 Mk.
- Pfeiffer* (A.) Antike Münzbilder, für den Schulgebrauch zusammengestellt. 8vo. viii, 24 pp., 2 plates. Winterthur. 1 Mk. 60.
- Sappho*. Les poésies de Sappho, traduites en entier pour la première fois par André Lebey. 32mo. 143 pp. Paris.
- Torp* (Alfr.) Zu den phrygischen Inschriften aus römischer Zeit. 8vo. 23 pp. Kristiania. 80 Pf. [Aus 'Videnskabselskabets Skrifter'.]
- Urkunden (Aegyptische) aus den Kgl. Museen zu Berlin. Herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung. Griechische Urkunden. Vol. II. Part 4. 4to. Pp. 97—128. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk. 40.
- Weise* (Dr. Rich.) Der athenische Bundesgenossenkrieg. 4to. 40 pp. Berlin, Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- Weltmann* (M.) Die pneumatische Schule bis auf Archigenes in ihrer Entwicklung dargestellt. (Philologische Untersuchungen, herausgegeben von A. Kiessling und U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. Part 14.) 8vo. 239 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 7 Mk.
- Wohlrab* (Mart.) Die altklassischen Realien im Gymnasium. 3d. Edition. 8vo. xii, 86 pp. Cloth. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.